SHOUT
SHARE
IT

S. 2702.
9.

THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

The Official Organ of

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

VOLUME 9

Edited by

FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

BRITISH MUSEUM NATURAL HISTORY

LONDON:

Printed by Order of the International Trust for
Zoological Nomenclature

and

Sold on behalf of the International Commission on Zoological
Nomenclature by the International Trust at its Publications Office
41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.
1952—1956

(*All rights reserved*)

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

COMPOSITION DURING THE PERIOD COVERED BY THE PUBLICATION OF THE PRESENT VOLUME

A. The Officers of the Commission

Honorary Life President: Dr. Karl Jordan (*British Museum* (*Natural History*), *Zoological Museum, Tring, Herts., England*)

President: Professor James Chester Bradley (*Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*) (12th August 1953)

Vice-President: Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (*Sao Paulo, Brazil*) (12th August 1953)

Secretary: Mr. Francis Hemming (*London, England*) (27th July 1948)

B. The Members of the Commission

(*Arranged in order of precedence by reference to date of election or of most recent re-election as prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology*)

Professor H. Boschma (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The Netherlands*) (1st January 1947)
Senor Dr. Angel Cabrera (*La Plata, Argentina*) (27th July 1948)
Mr. Francis Hemming (*London, England*) (27th July 1948) (*Secretary*)
Dr. Joseph Pearson (*Tasmanian Museum, Hobart, Tasmania, Australia*) (27th July 1948) (pp. 1–286 only)
Dr. Henning Lemche (*Universitetets Zoologiscke Museum, Copenhagen, Denmark*) (27th July 1948)
Professor Teiso Esaki (*Kyushu University, Fukuoka, Japan*) (17th April 1950)
Professor Pierre Bonnet (*Université de Toulouse, France*) (9th June 1950)
Mr. Norman Denbigh Riley (*British Museum* (*Natural History*) *London*) (9th June 1950)
Professor Tadeusz Jaczewski (*Institute of Zoology, Polish Academy of Sciences Warsaw, Poland*) (15th June 1950)
Professor Robert Mertens (*Natur-Museum u. Forschungs-Institut Senckenberg, Frankfurt a.M., Germany*) (5th July 1950)
Professor Erich Martin Hering (*Zöologisches Museum der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Germany*) (5th July 1950)
Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (*S. Paulo, Brazil*) (12th August 1953) (*Vice-President*)
Professor J. R. Dymond (*University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada*) (12th August 1953)
Professor J. Chester Bradley (*Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*) (12th August 1953) (*President*)
Professor Harold E. Vokes (*Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, U.S.A.*) (12th August 1953)

B. The Members of the Commission (*continued*)

Professor Béla Hankó (*Mezőgazdasági Museum, Budapest, Hungary*) (12th August 1953)

Dr. Norman R. Stoll (*Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, New York, N.Y., U.S.A.*) (12th August 1953)

Mr. P. C. Sylvester-Bradley (*Sheffield University, Sheffield, England*) (12th August 1953) (exclusive of pp. 1–158)

Dr. L. B. Holthuis (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The Netherlands*) (12th August 1953) (exclusive of pp. 1–158)

Dr. K. H. L. Key (*Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation, Canberra, A.C.T., Australia*) (15th October 1954) (from p. 287 onwards only)

Dr. Alden H. Miller (*Museum of Vertebrate Zoology, University of California, U.S.A.*) (29th October 1954) (from p. 287 onwards only)

Doc. Dr. Ferdinand Prantl (*Národni Museum v Praze, Prague, Czechoslovakia*) (30th October 1954) (from p. 287 onwards only)

Professor Dr. Wilhelm Kühnelt (*Zoologisches Institut der Universität, Vienna, Austria*) (6th November 1954) (from p. 287 onwards only)

Professor F. S. Bodenheimer (*The Hebrew University, Jerusalem, Israel*) (11th November 1954) (from p. 287 onwards only)

Professor Ernst Mayr (*Museum of Comparative Zoology at Harvard College, Cambridge, Massachusetts, U.S.A.*) (4th December 1954) (from p. 287 onwards only)

Professor Enrico Tortenese (*Museo di Storia Naturale " G. Doria ", Genoa, Italy*) (16th December 1954) (from p. 351 onwards only)

C. The Staff of the Secretariat of the Commission

Honorary Secretary : Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Honorary Personal Assistant to the Secretary : Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming

Honorary Archivist : Mr. Francis J. Griffin, A.L.A.

Consulting Classical Advisor : Professor the Rev. L. W. Grensted, M.A., D.D.

"*Official Lists* " *Section* : Miss D. N. Noakes, B.Sc.

" *Règles* " *Section* : Miss A. F. Kerr, M.A. (from 18th July 1955)

Administrative Officer : Mrs. S. C. Watkins, M.A. (to 29th April 1955)
Mrs. N. M. A. Guzelian (from 20th June 1955)

Secretariat : Mrs. J. H. Newman
Mrs. J. Mantell
Mrs. B. M. Weidema, A.L.A.

Indexer : Miss M. Cosh, M.A.

Translator : Mrs. R. H. R. Hopkin

International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature

Chairman : The Right Hon. Walter Elliott, C.H., M.C., F.R.S., M.P.

Managing Director and Secretary : Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Publications Officer : Mrs. C. Rosner

Addresses of the Commission and the Trust

Secretariat of the Commission : 28 Park Village East, Regent's Park, London, N.W.1

Offices of the Trust : 41 Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.

FOREWORD

The present is the fourth volume of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* wholly devoted to the publication of individual nomenclatorial problems submitted by specialists to the International Commission for decision. The immediately preceding volume in this series was Volume 6 which, apart from the concluding (index) part was completed on 29th August 1952. At that time the Office of the Commission had received a large number of applications relating to the nomenclature of birds, most of which had been submitted to the Commission by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature which had been established by the Tenth International Ornithological Congress at its meeting at Uppsala in 1950. Already before the completion of Volume 6 of the *Bulletin* it had been decided to publish these ornithological applications in a single instalment and the arrangements for this purpose were by that time well advanced. In consequence it was possible to publish this large first instalment of the present volume (on 15th October 1952) only seven weeks after the conclusion of Volume 6. This instalment which contained 31 applications was issued as a Triple-Part (Part 1/3). At that date comments had been received in the Office of the Commission in regard to a large number of applications previously published in Volume 6 and it was decided that special arrangements should be made for the publication of these comments as soon as possible in order that these might be readily available by the time that the Commission came to vote on the applications in question. Thus it was that the next instalment of the present volume, while containing only four new applications comprised no less than 59 comments on other applications. This instalment which was issued as Double-Part 4-5 was published on 30th December 1952. Owing to the need in 1953 for concentrating all the resources of the Office of the Commission, first, on the preparations for the Session of the Commission to be held at Copenhagen in July of that year and, later, on the arrangements for the publication of the decisions on nomenclature taken by the Copenhagen Congress, it was necessary during that year to suspend publication of further instalments of the *Bulletin* dealing with individual problems of nomenclature submitted to the Commission for decision. This was the reason why, although two volumes (Volumes 8 and 10) of the *Bulletin* dealing with the amendment or clarification of the *Règles* which figured on the Copenhagen Agenda were published in 1953, no progress in regard to the present volume was made in that year. Work on the present volume was resumed early in 1954 and the next instalment (Part 6) appeared on 11th May of that year. Further Parts were published as rapidly as possible, the last

Part (Part 11), apart from the index Part, appearing on 30th December 1954. At that date a number of earlier volumes either of the *Bulletin* or in the *Opinions and Declarations* Series still lacked their concluding index Parts. When these had been published work was begun on the corresponding Part of the present volume, which was published on 31st January 1956.

2. Attention must at this point be drawn to an apparent inconsistency in matters of terminology as between the first five and the later Parts respectively in which the present volume was published. This arises from the fact that the earlier Parts were published before the Fourteenth International Congress of Zoology, Copenhagen, 1953, which amended the *Règles* in regard to a matter of terminology. The change in question was the substitution of the expression " specific name " for the expression " specific trivial name " to denote the second component of the binominal combination which constitutes the scientific name of a species. Consequential on this change the word " Trivial " in the title of the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* and in the title of the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* was dropped.

3. In two other respects also applications published in the later portions of the present volume differ from those included in the Parts published in 1952. The first of these arises from the decision by the Copenhagen Congress to establish an *Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology* and an *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family-Group Names in Zoology* for taxa of categories of this group. The second of these differences flows from a decision by the above Congress to establish an *Official List of Works Approved as Available for Zoological Nomenclature* and an *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Works in Zoological Nomenclature.* It is proposed later to make good by means of *Directions* given by the Commission any omissions under either of the above heads which occur in applications published in the present volume. In so far as may be possible proposals on these matters will be laid before the Commission in sufficient time to permit of the Commission's decisions thereon being incorporated in the *Opinions* giving the Commission's decisions on the applications in the present volume. In other cases proposals will be laid before the Commission separately with a view to the Commission's decisions being embodied in *Directions* which will be incorporated in each case in the volume of the *Opinions and Declarations* Series in which the relevant *Opinion* is published.

4. The present volume which comprises 506 pages (T.P.—XXXV, i—xxix, 14—42) contains, in addition to the Accounts of the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature for the years 1952 and 1953 with the Reports of the Committee of Management thereon and to the obituary of the late Dr. James Lee Peters, at the time of his death the President of the International Commission, 151 papers of which 70 are original applications submitted to the International Commission for decision and 81 are comments by specialists on applications submitted by other authors. Of these, 32 relate to applications published in the present volume, and 49 to applications published in earlier volumes.

5. Of the 70 original applications one deals simultaneously with proposals relating to the status of individual books and with proposals relating to the status of individual names, and another deals simultaneously with individual names and with the proposed adoption of a *Declaration*. For practical purposes, therefore, the volume contains 72 applications submitted to the Commission for decision. Similarly 21 of the applications published in the present volume are applications submitted by two or more joint authors. When account is taken of this fact the number of applicants is found to be 123.

6. Of the 72 applications published in the present volume three asked for *Declarations* from the International Commission (or equivalent rulings) on the meaning of particular provisions in the *Règles*. Further, five applications relate to the status of names published in certain books. Thus the number of applications concerned exclusively with individual scientific names is 64.

7. The 64 applications relating to individual names published in the present volume, when grouped by reference to the Classes of the Animal Kingdom to which the genera or species concerned belong, are distributed as follows :—

TABLE 1

Distribution of applications by Classes of the Animal Kingdom

Name of Class	*Number of applications*
Ciliophora	1
Crustacea	8
Insecta	13
Gastropoda	4
Cephalopoda	4
Amphibia	1
Osteichthyes	2
Aves	30
Mammalia	1
Total	64

8. When the 123 applicants are arranged by reference to the countries in which they are resident, applications are seen to have been received from specialists in the following countries (arranged in alphabetical order) :

TABLE 2

Distribution of applicants by country of residence

Country of Residence	*Number of applicants*
Argentina	1
Australia	4
Czechoslovakia	1
France	5
Germany	10
Japan	2
Netherlands	3
Switzerland	1
United Kingdom	43
United States of America	53
Total	123

9. Fifty-one (70 per cent.) of the applications published in the present volume are applications by specialists for the use by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of its Plenary Powers for the purpose of promoting stability and universality in nomenclature and of preventing the confusion which, in the opinion of the applicants, would result from the application of the ordinary provisions of the *Règles* in these cases. Of these cases 49 were concerned with individual names and the remaining two with the status of individual books.

10. The following table (Table 3) gives particulars of the proposals contained in applications published in the present volume for additions of names to the *Official Lists* relating to specific names, generic names, family-group names, and the titles of zoological works, and to the corresponding *Official Indexes* of rejected and invalid names and works :

TABLE 3

Proposals for additions to the " Official Lists " and " Official Indexes " respectively

Category	*Official Lists (valid names and works approved as available for zoological nomenclature)*	*Official Indexes (rejected and invalid names and works)*
Specific names	105	76
Generic names	64	230
Family-Group names	9	13
Titles of works	1	4
Totals	179	323

11. Of the 81 comments published in the present volume, including comments incorporated either in the original application or in summaries later submitted by the applicant, six relate to more than one application. When account is taken of this fact, the total number of comments on applications is found to be 87. Of these one was a comment on a proposed *Declaration* and four were comments relating to the status of books. The remaining 82 comments relate to applications concerning individual names.

12. If the comments relating to individual names are grouped according to the Class of the Animal Kingdom to which the taxa concerned belong, the distribution of the comments is found to be as follows :

TABLE 4

Distribution of comments on applications relating to names, by Classes of the Animal Kingdom

Name of Class	*Number of Comments*
Ciliophora	1
Nematoda	4
Crustacea	6
Insecta	47
Gastropoda	4
Pelecypoda	2
Cephalopoda	1
Echinoidea	1
Osteichthyes	2
Amphibia	2
Reptilia	8
Aves	2
Mammalia	2
Total	82

13. The 81 comments published in the present volume included four submitted by two or more joint authors. When we take this into account, we find the total number of specialists submitting comments amounted to 349.

14. When the authors of comments published in this volume are grouped by reference to their country of residence, the distribution is found to be as follows :

TABLE 5

Distribution of authors of comments by country of residence of the authors concerned

Country of Residence	*Number of authors of comments*
Algeria	2
Angola	1
Argentina	2
Australia	8
Belgium	5
Brazil	11
Canada	18
Chile	2
Czechoslovakia	2
Denmark	2
Egypt	1
Finland	3
France	6
Germany	20
Guatemala	1
Hawaii	2
India	2
Italy	4
Japan	4
Malaya	3
Mexico	4
Netherlands	10
New Zealand	4
Panama	2
Philippines	1
Portugal	1
Spain	1
Sweden	3
Switzerland	4
Trinidad	1
Uganda	1
Union of South Africa	7
United Kingdom	52
United States of America	155
Uruguay	1
Venezuela	3
Total	349

15. For the preparation of the authors' and subject indexes of the present volume the Commission is indebted to Miss Mary Cosh, M.A., who succeeded Miss Joan Kelley, B.Sc., in the post of Indexer of Publications on 1st January 1955.

FRANCIS HEMMING
Secretary to the International Commission
on Zoological Nomenclature

28 Park Village East,
Regent's Park,
London, N.W.1.

11*th October* 1955.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature:

Balance Sheet as at 31st December 1952 and Income and Expenditure Accounts for the year 1952, with Report of Committee of Management thereon iii

Balance Sheet as at 31st December 1953 and Income and Expenditure Accounts for the year 1953, with Report of Committee of Management thereon xv

Establishment by the Tenth International Ornithological Congress of a Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature. Letter dated 20th October, 1951, from Colonel R. Meinertzhagen, Chairman of the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature of the International Ornithological Congress 4

Proposed use of the Plenary Powers to put an end to the confusion arising from the discordant use of the generic name *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Aves). Application submitted by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature of the International Ornithological Congress 6

Enclosure: Proposals in regard to the generic name *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758, submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature 7

Report on the problems raised by the generic name *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Aves). By Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E. (*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* 8

Appendix 1: Application regarding the name *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758, submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature, as revised in certain minor respects in agreement with the Chairman of the Standing Committee 13

Appendix 2: Report on the type species of the nominal genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758, prepared by Mr. Francis Hemming in response to an invitation by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 1948 15

Proposed use of the Plenary Powers to suppress the trivial name *caspicus* Hablizl, 1783, as published in the binominal combination *Colymbus caspicus* (Class Aves). Application submitted by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature of the International Ornithological Congress 30

Enclosure: The trivial name comprised in the specific name *Colymbus caspicus* Hablizl, 1783.. 30

Page

Annexe to application : Extract from a paper entitled " The earliest description of the Black-necked Grebe " published in the *Ibis* in 1948 31

Proposed use of the Plenary Powers to suppress four trivial names for birds published by Anton August Heinrich Lichtenstein in 1793. Application submitted by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature of the International Ornithological Congress.. 32

Enclosure : Three trivial names published for birds by Lichtenstein (A.) in 1793 proposed to be suppressed under the Plenary Powers 34

Annexe to publication : Extract from a paper by Meise & Stresemann published in 1950 (*Ibis* **92** : 22–26).. 35

Proposed use of the Plenary Powers to suppress the trivial name *nortoniensis* Gmelin, 1789, as published in the binominal combination *Fringilla nortoniensis* (Class Aves). Application submitted by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature of the International Ornithological Congress 38

Enclosure : The trivial name comprised in the specific name *Fringilla nortoniensis* Gmelin, 1789 38

Annexe to application : Extract from a paper entitled " Birds collected in the North Pacific Area during Capt. James Cook's last Voyage (1778 and 1779) " (Stresemann, 1949, *Ibis* **91** : 244–255) 39

Proposed use of the Plenary Powers to suppress seven trivial names published by Gmelin in 1788 and 1789 for birds which until 1950 remained unidentified. Application submitted by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature of the International Ornithological Congress 40

Enclosure : Seven trivial names published for birds by Gmelin in 1789 proposed to be suppressed under the Plenary Powers .. 42

Proposed use of the Plenary Powers to validate the trivial name *elegans* Gould, 1837, as published in the binominal combination *Malurus elegans* (Class Aves). By H. M. Whittell, O.B.E. (on behalf of the Checklist Committee of the Royal Australasian Ornithologists' Union) 44

Proposed use of the Plenary Powers to suppress for nomenclatorial purposes a paper by Forster (J.R.) containing new names for certain Australian birds published in 1794 in volume 5 of the *Magazin von merkwürdigen neuen Reise Beschreibungen* by Ernst Mayr (*The American Museum of Natural History ; New York*), Dean Amadon (*The American Museum of Natural History, New York*) ; Jean

Page

Delacour (*The American Museum of Natural History, New York*); L. Glavert (*Natural History Museum, Perth, Western Australia*); Robert Cushman Murphy (*The American Museum of Natural History, New York*); D. L. Serventy (*Nedlands, Western Australia*); H. M. Whittell, O.B.E. (*Bridgetown, Western Australia*) 45

On the question whether it is necessary that the Plenary Powers should be used to suppress the trivial name *novaehollandiae* Latham, 1790, as published in the combination *Muscicapa novaehollandiae*, in order to make available the trivial name *chrysops* Latham, 1801, as published in the combination *Sylvia chrysops* (Class Aves). By Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E. (*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*) 47

Support by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature of the International Ornithological Congress for the proposals submitted by Dr. Ernst Mayr and others for the use of the Plenary Powers to suppress for nomenclatorial purposes a paper containing new names for certain Australian birds published by Forster in 1794. Communication received from the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature of the International Ornithological Congress 50

Proposed emendation, under Article 19, of the trivial names of three species of bird which, when first published, were incorrectly spelt. Application submitted by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature of the International Ornithological Congress.. .. 52

Enclosure : Proposed correction of faulty orthography in the case of the trivial names of three species of bird.. 52

Proposed validation under the Plenary Powers of the generic name *Pyrrhocorax* [Tunstall], 1771 (Class Aves) for the Chough. Application submitted by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature of the International Ornithological Congress 53

Enclosure 1 : Proposed validation under the Plenary Powers of the generic name *Pyrrhocorax* [Tunstall], 1771 53

Enclosure 2 : Note, dated 25th September 1950, by Professor J. Berlioz (*Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris*).. .. 54

On the application relating to the generic names *Pyrrhocorax* [Tunstall], 1771, and *Coracia* Brisson, 1760 (Class Aves), submitted by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature of the International Ornithological Congress. By Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E. (*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*) 54

Page

Proposed use of the Plenary Powers to validate the trivial name *philomelos* Brehm, 1831, as published in the binominal combination *Turdus philomelos*, as the trivial name of the Song Thrush. Application submitted by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature of the International Ornithological Congress 62

Enclosure : *Turdus philomelos* versus *Turdus ericetorum* 62

On the proposed use of the Plenary Powers to secure that the trivial name *philomelos* Brehm, 1831, as published in the binominal combination *Turdus philomelos*, shall be oldest available name for the Song Thrush. By Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E. (*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*) 63

Proposed use of the Plenary Powers to suppress three completely overlooked trivial names applied by Linnaeus to North American birds in 1776, together with an equally overlooked generic name published on the same occasion. Application submitted by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature of the International Ornithological Congress 65

Enclosure 1 : Application submitted by nine American ornithologists. E. R. Blake (*Chicago Natural History Museum, Chicago, Ill.*) ; H. G. Deignan (*U.S. National Museum, Washington, D.C.*) ; John J. Emlen, Jr. (*Zoological Laboratory, University of Wisconsin*) ; Alden H. Miller (*California*) ; Frank A. Pitelka (*Museum of Vertebrate Zoology, University of California, Berkeley*) ; A. L. Rand (*Chicago Natural History Museum, Chicago, Ill.*) ; Charles H. Rogers (*Princeton, New Jersey*) ; M. A. Traylor, Jr. (*Chicago Natural History Museum, Chicago, Ill.*) ; Albert Wolfson (*North Western University, Evanston, Ill.*) 66

Enclosure 2 : Statement prepared by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature 67

On the proposal by the Nomenclature Committee of the American Museum of Natural History, New York, for the suppression under the Plenary Powers of the Linnean names published in 1776 in the *Catalogue of Edwards's Natural History* with special reference to the new names for birds. By Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E. (*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*) 68

Annexe 1 : One new generic name for a bird by Linnaeus published in 1776 in the *Catalogue of Edwards' Natural History* 69

Annexe 2 : New trivial names for birds by Linnaeus published in 1776 in the *Catalogue of Edwards' Natural History* 69

Page

First Report on the species which under the *Règles* are the type species of certain genera of birds discussed, but left unsettled, in *Opinion* 16. By Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E. (*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*) 70

Appendix 1 : Seventeen generic names in the Class Aves discussed but not settled in *Opinion* 16, now proposed to be added to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*.. 73

Appendix 2 : Seventeen specific trivial names, being the trivial names of the type species of the nominal genera enumerated in Appendix 1, now proposed to be added to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 74

Type species of certain genera of birds, discussed but left unsettled, in *Opinion* 16 : support for proposals submitted in the Secretary's Report. By Richard Meinertzhagen, D.S.O. (*London*) 76

Proposed addition to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* of the trivial names of two Siberian birds. By James L. Peters (*Museum of Comparative Zoology at Harvard College, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.*) 77

Proposed use of the Plenary Powers to secure that the name *Columba migratoria* Linnaeus, 1766, shall be the oldest available name for the Passenger Pigeon, the type species of the genus *Ectopistes* Swainson, 1827. By Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E. (*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*) 80

Proposed correction in the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* of incorrect dates and bibliographical references given for the generic name *Balaeniceps* Gould, 1850, and for the name of its type species (Class Aves) (correction of an error in *Opinion* 67). By Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E. (*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*) 85

Suggested review of the entries on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* relating to the names *Oedicnemus* Temminck, 1815, and *Burhinus* Illiger, 1811 (Class Aves). By Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E. (*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*) 86

Page

Proposed use of the Plenary Powers to suppress four generic names for birds published by Brisson in 1760 which have long been overlooked and which invalidate as homonyms four names placed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* (correction of erroneous entries in *Opinion* 67). By Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E. (*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*) 89

Proposed use of the Plenary Powers to suppress the name *Gallinago* Brisson, 1760 (Class Aves), and proposed substitution of *Capella* Frenzel, 1801, for *Gallinago* Koch, 1816, on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* (proposed correction of an erroneous entry in *Opinion* 67). By Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E. (*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*) 93

Proposed addition to the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* of the trivial name *syriacus* Rothschild, 1910, as published in the combination *Struthio camelus syriacus*, the trivial name of the Syrian Ostrich (Class Aves). By R. Meinertzhagen, D.S.O. (*London*) 96

Proposed use of the Plenary Powers to suppress the name *Tyrannula* Swainson, 1827, and to designate a type species for *Myiobius* Darwin, 1839 (Class Aves). By John T. Zimmer (*The American Museum of Natural History, New York*) 98

Support for the proposal for the use of the Plenary Powers to suppress the generic name *Tyrannula* Swainson, 1827 (Class Aves). By the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature of the International Ornithological Congress 101

Request for a ruling that the trivial names of two woodpeckers, each consisting of a slight variant of a previously published name based upon a word transliterated into the Latin alphabet from a language using another alphabet, be treated as junior homonyms of the earlier names so published. By the Marquess Hachisuka (*Atami, Shizuoka Ken, Japan*) 102

Proposed use of the Plenary Powers to suppress the trivial name *cyanea* Vieillot, 1818, as published in the combination *Muscicapa cyanea*, for the purpose of validating the trivial name *cyanea* Hume, 1877, as published in the combination *Muscitrea cyanea* (Class Aves). By Charles Vaurie (*The American Museum of Natural History, New York*) 104

Page

Proposed use of the Plenary Powers to validate the trivial name *ferruginea* Hodgson, 1845, as published in the combination *Hemichelidon ferruginea*, by the suppression of the trivial name *ferruginea* Merrem, 1784, as published in the combination *Muscicapa ferruginea* (Class Aves). By Charles Vaurie (*The American Museum of Natural History, New York*) 105

James Lee Peters : Obituary 111

Proposed use of the Plenary Powers to correct an erroneous entry relating to the name *Astacus* Pallas, 1772 (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda), made in the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* in *Opinion* 104. By Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E. (*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*) 113

On the action which it is desirable should be taken to correct the erroneous entry relating to the name *Astacus* Pallas, 1772 (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda) made in the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* by *Opinion* 104. By L. B. Holthuis (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The Netherlands*) 118

Proposed use of the Plenary Powers to validate the name *Favus* Lanchester, 1900 (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda) (proposed correction of an error in *Opinion* 73). By Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E. (*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*) 119

On the proposed use of the Plenary Powers to validate the entry on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* of *Favus* Lanchester, 1900 (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda). By L. B. Holthuis (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The Netherlands*).. .. 121

Support for the proposed use of the Plenary Powers to validate the entry on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* of the name *Favus* Lanchester, 1900 (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda). By M. F. W. Tweedie (*Raffles Museum and Library, Singapore*) 121

Support for the proposed use of the Plenary Powers to validate the entry on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* of the name *Favus* Lanchester, 1900 (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda). By I. Gordon, D.Sc., Ph.D. (*British Museum (Natural History), London*).. 121

Page

Support for the proposed validation of the generic name *Favus* Lanchester, 1900 (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda) under the Plenary Powers. By Heinrich Balss (*Hauptkonservator der Zoologischen Staatsammlung, München, a.D., Germany*) 121

Proposed addition of the generic names *Portunus* Weber, 1795, and *Macropipus* Prestandrea, 1833 (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda) to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*. By L. B. Holthuis (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The Netherlands*).. 122

Support for Dr. L. B. Holthuis's proposals relating to the generic name *Portunus* Weber, 1795 (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda). By Fenner A. Chace, Jr. (*Smithsonian Institution, U.S. National Museum, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*) 127

Proposed use of the Plenary Powers to validate the trivial name *flavipes* Olivier, 1795, as published in the combination *Dytiscus flavipes* (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera). By J. Balfour-Browne, M.A. (*Department of Entomology, British Museum* (*Natural History*), *London*) .. 128

Proposed use of the Plenary Powers to suppress the generic name *Acmea* Hartmann, 1821, and to validate the generic names *Acmaea* Eschscholtz, 1833, and *Truncatella* Risso, 1826 (Class Gastropoda). By A. Myra Keen and Siemon W. Muller (*Stanford University, Stanford, California, U.S.A.*) 130

Support for the solution of the *Acmea*/*Acmaea* problem (Class Gastropoda) suggested by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature. By Avery R. Test (*Ann Arbor, Michigan, U.S.A.*).. .. 130

Support for the proposed use of the Plenary Powers to validate the trivial name *adippe*, as published in the combination *Papilio adippe* by Denis & Schiffermüller in 1775 (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera). By B. J. Lempke (*Amsterdam, The Netherlands*) .. 131

A comment on the proposed solution of the *niobe*/*cydippe*/*adippe* problem (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera) by Jiří Paclt (*Head of the Department of Biology, Forest Products Research Institute, Bratislava, Czechoslovakia*) 131

Support for the proposed use of the Plenary Powers to validate the trivial name *adippe* as published in the combination *Papilio adippe* by Denis & Schiffermüller in 1775 (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera). By Felix Bryk (*Naturhistoriska Riksmuseum, Stockholm, Sweden*) .. 132

Page

Support for the proposed use of the Plenary Powers in connection with the trivial name *adippe*, as published by Denis & Schiffermüller in 1775 in the combination *Papilio adippe* (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera). By B. C. S. Warren (*Folkestone, England*) 132

Support for the action proposed in regard to the names involved in the *niobe/adippe* complex (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera). By Wm. T. M. Forbes (*Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*) 133

Comment on the action proposed in relation to the trivial names involved in the *niobe/cydippe/adippe* complex (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera). By F. Martin Brown (*Colorado Springs, Colorado, U.S.A.*) 134

Support for the proposed use of the Plenary Powers for validating the trivial name *adippe*, as published in the combination *Papilio adippe* in the Vienna catalogue of 1775 (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera). By Henry Beuret (*Neuewelt, Basle, Switzerland*) 135

On the authorship to be attributed to the anonymous work published in Vienna in 1775 under the title *Ankündung eines systematischen Werkes von den Schmetterlingen der Wiener Gegend.* By Francis Hemming, C.M.B., C.B.E. (*London*) 135

Support for the action proposed in regard to the trivial names involved in the *niobe/cydippe/adippe* complex (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera). By Ernest L. Bell (*Flushing, N.Y., U.S.A.*) 136

Support for the proposed use of the Plenary Powers to validate the trivial name *adippe*, as published in the combination *Papilio adippe*, as from Denis & Schiffermüller, 1775 (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera). By Eugene Munroe (*Department of Agriculture, Division of Entomology, Ottawa, Canada*) 136

Support for the proposed use of the Plenary Powers to validate the trivial name *adippe* as published in the combination *Papilio adippe* by Denis & Schiffermüller in 1775 (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera). By Elli Franz (*Senckenbergische Naturforschende Gesellschaft, Frankfurt a.M., Germany*) 136

Support for the proposed use of the Plenary Powers to validate the trivial name *adippe*, as published in the combination *Papilio adippe* by Denis & Schiffermüller in 1775 (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera). By Ernst Mayr (*The American Museum of Natural History, New York*) 137

Page

Support for the proposed use of the Plenary Powers to validate the trivial name *adippe*, as published in the combination *Papilio adippe*, as from Denis & Schiffermüller, 1775 (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera). By Karl P. Schmidt (*Chicago Natural History Museum, Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.*) 137

Support for the proposals relating to the trivial names involved in the *niobe/cydippe/adippe* complex and to the trivial name *plexippus* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Papilio plexippus* (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera). By Bryant Mather (*Jackson, Mississippi, U.S.A.*) 138

Support for the action proposed in regard to the trivial names involved in the *niobe/cydippe/adippe* complex and in regard to the trivial name *plexippus* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Papilio plexippus* (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera). By T. N. Freeman (*Department of Agriculture, Division of Entomology, Ottawa, Canada*) 138

Support for the proposal submitted by Mr. C. F. dos Passos in relation to the trivial name *plexippus* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Papilio plexippus* (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera). By F. Martin Brown (*Colorado Springs, Colorado, U.S.A.*) 139

Comment on Mr. C. F. dos Passos' proposal relating to the trivial name *plexippus* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Papilio plexippus* (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera). By Eugene Munroe (*Department of Agriculture, Division of Entomology, Ottawa, Canada*) 139

Support for Mr. C. F. dos Passos' proposals relating to the trivial name *plexippus* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Papilio plexippus* (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera). By L. P. Grey (*Lincoln, Maine, U.S.A.*) 140

Support for the action proposed in regard to the trivial name *plexippus* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Papilio plexippus* (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera). By Karl P. Schmidt (*Chicago Natural History Museum, Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.*) 140

Proposed retention of the trivial name *dentatus* Diesing, 1839, as published in the combination *Stephanurus dentatus* (Class Nematoda). By Allen McIntosh (*United States Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Administration, Bureau of Animal Industry, Agricultural Research Center, Beltsville, Maryland, U.S.A.*) 141

Page

On the problem relating to the name *Stephanurus* Diesing, 1839 (Class Nematoda) raised by Dr. Ellsworth C. Dougherty. By John M. Lucker (*Zoological Division, Agricultural Research Center, Beltsville, Maryland, U.S.A.*) 143

On the trivial name to be used for the kidney worm of swine (Class Nematoda) : comment on proposal submitted by Dr. Ellsworth C. Dougherty. By Harold W. Manter (*University of Nebraska, Department of Zoology, Lincoln, Nebraska, U.S.A.*) 143

Comment on the application submitted by Dr. Ellsworth C. Dougherty in regard to the trivial name *dentatus* Diesing, 1839, as published in the combination *Stephanurus dentatus* (Class Nematoda). By Robert Ph. Dollfus (*Laboratoire d'Helminthologie Coloniale et de Parasitologie Comparée, Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris*) 144

Support for Professor Harold E. Vokes's proposal relating to the generic name *Mytilus* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Pelecypoda). By Joseph P. E. Morrison (*Smithsonian Institution, United States National Museum, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*) 144

Comment on Dr. Jiří Paclt's proposal relating to the generic name *Sphinx* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera). By John G. Franclemont (*United States Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*) .. 144

Comment on Dr. Jiří Paclt's proposal relating to the generic name *Diloba* Boisduval, 1840 (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera). By John G. Franclement (*United States Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*) 145

Support for Dr. Gilbert Ranson's proposal relating to the name *Gryphaea* Lamarck, 1819 (Class Pelecypoda). By the Members of the Shellfish Sub-Committee of the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea.. 145

Dr. John G. Franclemont's proposal for the use of the Plenary Powers to suppress the generic name *Phalaena* Linnaeus, 1758, and to validate, as from 1758, the terms employed by Linnaeus for groups of that genus (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera) : proposed addition of *Phalaena* Linnaeus, 1758 to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*. By Jiří Paclt (*Bratislava, Czechoslovakia*) 147

Page

Support for Dr. John G. Franclemont's proposals for the use of the Plenary Powers to suppress the name *Phalaena* Linnaeus, 1758, and to validate, as of subgeneric status, the terms then applied to groups of species of that genus. By Wm. T. M. Forbes (*New York State College of Agriculture at Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*) 149

On the proposed use of the Plenary Powers to suppress the generic name *Phalaena* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera) and to validate, as of subgeneric status, certain terms then used by Linnaeus for sub-divisions of that genus : reply to certain criticisms made by Dr. Jiří Paclt. By John G. Franclemont (*United States Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Administration, Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*) 149

Support for Dr. John G. Franclemont's proposals for the use of the Plenary Powers to suppress the generic name *Phalaena* Linnaeus, 1758, and to validate, as of subgeneric status, the terms then used to denote groups of that genus (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera). By Frederick H. Rindge (*The American Museum of Natural History, New York*) 151

Support for Dr. John G. Franclemont's proposal relating to the generic name *Phalaena* Linnaeus, 1758, and matters connected therewith (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera). By A. Diakonoff (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The Netherlands*) 151

On the consequential action in regard to the generic name *Tinaea* Geoffroy, 1762 (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera) which would be needed in the event of approval being given to Dr. John G. Franclemont's proposal that the name *Tinea* should be validated under the Plenary Powers as from Linnaeus, 1758. By Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E. (*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*) 152

In support of the application to suspend the rules to (a) validate seven generic names of Linnaeus as of 1758, and designate their type species (b) suppress the generic name *Phalaena* Linnaeus, 1758, give preference to its typical subgenus *Noctua*, declare NOCTUIDAE the correct name for the family, and (c) validate one generic name of Linnaeus as of 1767 and designate its type species (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera). By Cyril F. dos Passos, LL.B. (*Research Associate, American Museum of Natural History, New York*) 153

Page

Comment of Dr. Jiří Paclt's proposal relating to the generic name *Bombyx* Fabricius, 1775 (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera). By John G. Franclemont (*United States Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*) 154

Comment on Dr. Jiří Paclt's proposal relating to the generic name *Pyralis* Fabricius, 1775 (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera). By John G. Franclemont (*United States Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*) 155

Support for the proposals submitted by Dr. Laurence M. Klauber regarding the trivial names *atrox* Baird and Girard, 1853, as published in the combination *Crotalus atrox*, and *polysticta* Cope, 1865, as published in the combination *Caudisona polysticta*, respectively (Class Reptilia, Order Squamata). By Howard K. Gloyd (*The Chicago Academy of Sciences, Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.*) .. 155

Support for Dr. Laurence M. Klauber's proposals for the use of the Plenary Powers to validate the trivial names *atrox* Baird and Girard, 1853, as published in the combination *Crotalus atrox*, and *polysticta* Cope, 1965, as published in the combination *Caudisona polysticta* (Class Reptilia). By C. B. Perkins (*Zoological Society of San Diego, Balboa Park, San Diego, California, U.S.A.*) 156

Support for Dr. Laurence M. Klauber's proposals for the use of the Plenary Powers to validate the trivial names *atrox* Baird and Girard, 1853, as published in the combination *Crotalus atrox*, and *polysticta* Cope, 1865, as published in the combination *Caudisona polysticta* (Class Reptilia). By Edward H. Taylor (*University of Kansas, Department of Zoology, Lawrence, Kansas, U.S.A.*) 156

Support for the Gans/Loveridge proposal for the use of the Plenary Powers to validate the generic name *Dasypeltis* Wagler, 1830 (Class Reptilia). By Hobart M. Smith (*University of Illinois, Department of Zoology, Urbana, Illinois, U.S.A.*) 157

Support for the use of the Plenary Powers to validate the generic name *Dasypeltis* Wagler, 1830, and to determine the identity of the species to which the trivial name *simus* Linnaeus, 1767, as published in the combination *Coluber simus*, should be applied (Class Reptilia). By James A. Oliver (*Curator of Reptiles, New York Zoological Society, Zoological Park, New York*) 157

Page

Support for Dr. Richard A. Edgren's proposal for the use of the Plenary Powers to determine the application of the trivial name *simus* Linnaeus, 1767, as published in the combination *Coluber simus* (Class Reptilia). By Hobart M. Smith (*University of Illinois, Department of Zoology, Urbana, Illinois, U.S.A.*) 157

Support for Dr. Richard A. Edgren's proposal for the use of the Plenary Powers in connection with the trivial name *simus* Linnaeus, 1767, as published in the combination *Coluber simus* (Class Reptilia). By Karl P. Schmidt and Clifford H. Pope (*Chicago Natural History Museum, Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.*) 158

Support for the proposed use of the Plenary Powers to determine the species to which the trivial name *simus* Linnaeus, 1767, as published in the combination *Coluber simus*, should apply (Class Reptilia). By Laurence M. Klauber (*San Diego, California, U.S.A.*) 158

Support for Dr. J. Wyatt Durham's proposal for the use of the Plenary Powers to validate the generic name *Mellita* as from Agassiz, 1841 (Class Echinoidea). By H. Engel (*Zoologisch Museum, Amsterdam, The Netherlands*) 158

Proposed use of the Plenary Powers to suppress the specific name *brouni* Hutton, 1901, as published in the combination *Drosophila brouni*, for the purpose of preserving the specific name *immigrans* Sturtevant, 1921, as published in the combination *Drosophila immigrans* (Class Insecta, Order Diptera). Joint application by : Ernst Mayr (*Curator, Whitney-Rothschild Collection, The American Museum of Natural History, New York*) ; J. T. Patterson (*Professor of Zoology, University of Texas, Austin, Texas*) ; Marshall P. Wheeler (*Assistant Professor of Zoology, University of Texas, Austin, Texas*) ; Warren P. Spencer (*Professor of Biology, College of Wooster, Ohio*) 161

Proposed use of the Plenary Powers to validate the specific name *pruni* Geoffroy, 1762, as published in the combination *Aphis pruni* (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera). By F. C. Hottes (*Grand Junction, Colorado, U.S.A.*) 163

Proposed addition to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* of the specific name *pini* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binominal combination *Aphis pini* and as interpreted by De Geer (1773) (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera). By F. C. Hottes (*Grand Junction, Colorado, U.S.A.*) 166

Page

Proposed use of the Plenary Powers to designate, as the type species of *Lachnus* Burmeister, 1835, and *Cinara* Curtis, 1835 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera) a species in harmony with accepted nomenclatorial practice. By F. C. Hottes (*Grand Junction, Colorado, U.S.A.*) 174

Report on the application submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in relation to the generic names *Lachnus* Burmeister, 1835, and *Cinara* Curtis, 1835 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera). By Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E. (*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*) 184

Proposed adoption of a *Declaration* on the question whether the insertion of a mark of interrogation invalidates a designation of a type species for a genus made under Rule (a) in Article 30 of the *Règles*. By Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E. (*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*) 188

Report on the status of new names published in Oken, [1815–1816], *Lehrbuch der Naturgeschichte*. By Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E. (*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*) 193

- Appendix 1 : Application relating to the status of the names in Oken's *Lehrbuch der Naturgeschichte* submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature. By Dr. Wilfred H. Osgood in May 1944 (*Chicago Natural History Museum, Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.*) 202
- Appendix 2 : On the system of classification used by Oken (L.) in his *Lehrbuch der Naturgeschichte* of 1816. By Karl Jordan, Ph.D., F.R.S. (*British Museum (Natural History), Zoological Museum, Tring*) 204
- Appendix 3 : On the question of the status of names in Oken, 1815–1816, *Lehrbuch der Naturgeschichte* 3 (Zoologie). By Angel Cabrera (*Eva Peron, F.C.N.G.R., Argentina*) 206
- Appendix 4 : On the question of the use of generic names published in Oken's *Lehrbuch der Naturgeschichte* (extract from a letter, dated 18th January 1947, from Mr. T. D. S. Morrison-Scott, *Deputy Keeper, Department of Zoology, British Museum (Natural History)* to the Secretary to the Commission) 207

On the need for validating the name *Stentor* Oken, 1815 (Class Ciliophora) for use in its accustomed sense. By Harold Kirby (*University of California, Berkeley, California, U.S.A.*) 208

Page

Report on the status of the generic name *Stentor* Oken, 1815 (Class Ciliophora, Sub-class Ciliata). By Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E. (*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*) 214

Request for a ruling on the question of the type species of *Ancilla* Lamarck, 1799 (Class Gastropoda). By Katherine V. W. Palmer (*Paleontological Research Institution, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*) 219

On the type species of *Ancilla* Lamarck, 1799 (Class Gastropoda), a genus established with no cited nominal species. By Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E. (*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*) 219

Proposed use of the Plenary Powers to validate the generic name *Malenargia* Meigen, 1828, by suppressing the name *Agapetes* Billberg, 1820 (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera). By Jiří Paclt (*Bratislava, Czechoslovakia*) 221

Support for Dr. J. Paclt's proposal for the suppression of the generic name *Agapetes* Billberg, 1820 (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera). By N. D. Riley (*British Museum (Natural History), London*) 222

Results of the Questionnaire on the proposed suppression, under the Plenary Powers, of the generic names in the Order Diptera (Class Insecta) by Meigen published in 1800 in the *Nouvelle classification des Mouches à deux Ailes*. By Curtis W. Sabrosky (*United States Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*) 225

A request for the use of the Plenary Powers to preserve the generic names in Geoffroy (1762) in the Order Diptera (Class Insecta). By Alan Stone, C. W. Sabrosky, W. W. Wirth and R. H. Foote (*Division of Insect Detection and Identification, Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*) 241

Proposed use of the Plenary Powers to suppress *Palmatotriton* Smith, 1945 (Class Amphibia, Order Caudata). By Hobart M. Smith (*Department of Zoology, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois, U.S.A.*) 247

Proposed use of the Plenary Powers to designate (i) a neotype for the nominal species *Ammonites mammillatus* Schlotheim, 1813 and (ii) a type species for the genus *Douvilleiceras* de Grossouvre, 1893 (Class Cephalopoda, Order Ammonoidea). By R. Casey (*Geological Survey and Museum, London*) 250

Page

Application for a ruling that works credited to S. A. Renier as of the dates 1804 and 1807 were not published within the meaning of Article 25 of the *Règles*. By A. Myra Keen (*Stanford University, Stanford, California, U.S.A.*) 257

Question whether it is desirable in the interests of nomenclatorial stability to validate under the Plenary Powers certain generic names from Renier, [1804], *Prospetto*, consequent upon the rejection of that work for nomenclatorial purposes. By Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E. (*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*) 263

Question of validating certain generic names under the Plenary Powers, in the interests of nomenclatorial stability as from Renier, [1807], *Tavola*, in the event of the rejection of that work for nomenclatorial purposes. By Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E. (*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*) 264

Supplementary application concerning the suppression of works by S. A. Renier (1804 and 1807). By L. R. Cox, M.A., Sc.D., F.R.S. (*British Museum (Natural History), London*) 265

Proposed adoption of a *Declaration* that a generic or specific name based solely upon the aptychus of an ammonite (Class Cephalopoda, Order Ammonoidea) be excluded from availability under Article 27 of the *Règles* and proposed suppression of certain such names under the Plenary Powers. By W. J. Arkell, M.A., D.Sc., F.R.S. (*Cambridge University, Sedgwick Museum, Cambridge*) 266

Comment on the type species of *Ancilla* Lamarck, 1799 (Class Gastropoda). By Katherine V. W. Palmer (*Paleontological Research Institution, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*) 269

Support for the proposed validation of the generic name *Stratiomys* Geoffroy, 1762 (Class Insecta, Order Diptera). By Maurice T. James (*State College of Washington, Pullman, Washington, U.S.A.*) .. 269

Proposed addition to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* of the generic name *Xantho* Leach, 1814 (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda). By L. B. Holthuis (*Rijkmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The Netherlands*) 270

Page

Request that the generic name *Notropis* Rafinesque, 1818 (Class Osteichthyes, Order Cyprinida, Family CYPRINIDAE) be placed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* : Question of possible use of the Commission's Plenary Powers to determine the gender of the generic name. By Reeve M. Bailey and Robert Rush Miller (*Museum of Zoology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan*) 272

Objection to the Bailey/Miller proposal that the generic name *Notropis* Rafinesque, 1818 (Class Osteichthyes) should be treated as being of the masculine gender and counter-proposal that this name be accepted as being of the feminine gender. By Carl L. Hubbs (*Scripps Institution of Oceanography, La Jolla, California, U.S.A.*) and W. I. Follett (*California Academy of Sciences, San Francisco, California, U.S.A.*) 274

On the question of the gender to be attributed to the generic name *Notropis* Rafinesque, 1818 (Class Osteichthyes). By Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E. (*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*) 276

Proposed use of the Plenary Powers to vary the type species of the genus *Cheloniceras* Hyatt, 1903 (Class Cephalopoda, Order Ammonoidea), in order to validate existing nomenclatorial practice. By R. Casey (*Geological Survey and Museum, London*) and C. W. Wright, M.A. (*London*) 278

Proposed limitation to the purposes of the Law of Priority of the suppression of the name *Argus* Bohadsch, 1761 (Class Gastropoda) effected in *Opinion* 185, in order to prevent the confusion which would otherwise arise in the Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera. By Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E. (*London*) and Cyril F. dos Passos (*Research Associate, Department of Insects and Spiders, The American Museum of Natural History, New York*) 281

Support for the Hemming/dos Passos proposal for the suppression of the generic name *Argus* Scopoli, 1763 (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera). By N. D. Riley, C.B.E. (*British Museum (Natural History), London*) 283

Proposed use of the Plenary Powers for the purpose of validating the specific name *minimus* Miller (J.S.), 1826, as published in the combination *Belemnites minimus* (Class Cephalopoda, Order Dibranchia). By H. H. Swinnerton, D.Sc. (*Nottingham, England*) 284

Page

Support for Dr. J. Paclt's proposal to validate the generic name *Melanargia* Meigen, 1828 (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera). By Erich M. Hering (*Zoologisches Museum der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Germany*) 285

Comment on Professor Hobart M. Smith's proposal relating to the generic name *Palmatotriton* Smith, 1945 (Class Amphibia, Order Caudata). By Curtis W. Sabrosky (*United States Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Service, Entomology Research Branch, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*) 286

Support for Professor Hobart M. Smith's proposal relating to the generic name *Palmatotriton* Smith, 1945 (Class Amphibia, Order Caudata). By Robert Mertens (*Natur-Museum u. Forschungs-Institut Senckenberg, Senckenberg-Anlage, Frankfurt a. Main, Germany*) 286

Personnel of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature :

Retirement of Dr. Joseph Pearson (*Hobart, Tasmania, Australia*) .. 289

Election as Commissioners of :—K. H. L. Key (*Canberra, Australia*); Alden H. Miller (*Berkeley, California, U.S.A.*); Ferdinand Prantl (*Prague, Czechoslovakia*); Wilhelm Kühnelt (*Vienna, Austria*); F. S. Bodenheimer (*Jerusalem, Israel*); Ernst Mayr (*Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.*) 289

Establishment by the Polish Academy of Science of a Group of Polish Zoologists to co-operate with the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature. Letter dated 29th January 1954, from Professor Dr. Tadeusz Jaczewski, Member of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, to Mr. Francis Hemming, Secretary to the Commission 291

Report on the question of the generic name to be used for the Virginia Deer of North America and the Fallow Deer of Europe. By Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E. (*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*) 293

Proposed use of the Plenary Powers for the purpose of stabilising the name for the Virginia Deer. By T. C. S. Morrison-Scott, D.S.C., M.A., D.Sc. (*British Museum (Natural History), London*) 298

Support for Dr. Morrison-Scott's proposal relating to the name for the Virginia Deer. By Karl P. Schmidt (*Chief Curator of Zoology*), Colin Campbell Sanborn (*Curator of Mammals*), D. Dwight Davies (*Curator of Anatomy*), Bryan Patterson (*Curator of Fossil Mammals*), and Rainer Zangerl (*Curator of Fossil Reptiles*) (all of the *Chicago Natural History Museum, Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.*) 299

Page

Counter-proposal to certain portions of Dr. T. C. S. Morrison-Scott's application regarding the stabilisation of the generic name for the Virginia Deer of America. By Angel Cabrera (*Cuidad Eva Peron, F.C.N.G.R., Argentina*) 299

Support for Dr. Morrison-Scott's proposal relating to the name for the Virginia Deer. By Robert K. Enders (*Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pennsylvania, U.S.A.*) 300

Proposed validation, under the Plenary Powers, of the generic name *Helicella* Férussac, 1821 (Class Gastropoda). By Lothar Forcart (*Custos, Zoological Department, Naturhistorisches Museum, Basel, Switzerland*) 301

Proposed use of the Plenary Powers to preserve the generic name *Helicella* Férussac, 1821 (Class Gastropoda) for use in its accustomed sense. By A. E. Ellis (*Epsom College, Epsom, England*) and R. Winckworth (*London, England*) 304

Formica Linnaeus, 1758 : Report on proposed action, under the Plenary Powers, to give valid force to the decision taken by the Commission in Paris : action needed because of circumstances not then known to the Commission. By Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E. (*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*) 309

Application for the re-examination and re-phrasing of the decision taken by the International Commission regarding the name of the type species of *Formica* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera). By I. H. H. Yarrow, M.A., Ph.D. (*British Museum (Natural History), London*) 313

Support for Dr. I. H. H. Yarrow's proposal for the re-phrasing of the decision taken by the International Commission regarding the name of the type species of *Formica* Linnaeus, 1758. By R. B. Benson, M.A. (*British Museum (Natural History), London*) ; G. E. J. Nixon, B.A. (*Commonwealth Institute of Entomology, London*) ; J. F. Perkins, B.Sc. (*British Museum (Natural History), London*) and O. W. Richards, D.Sc. (*Imperial College of Science and Technology, London*) 318

Page

Proposed use of the Plenary Powers to validate the generic name *Carinifex* Binney, 1865 (Class Gastropoda). By Joshua L. Baily, Jr. (*San Diego, California, U.S.A.*) 321

Comment on Dr. Joshua L. Baily, Jr.'s proposal for the validation of the generic name *Carinifex* Binney, 1865 (Class Gastropoda) and an alternative proposal. By Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E. (*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*) 326

Proposed use of the Plenary Powers to validate the family-group name XANTHINAE Dana, 1851 (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda). By Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E. (*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*) 329

Proposed use of the Plenary Powers to validate the generic name *Discias* Rathbun, 1902 (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda). By L. B. Holthuis (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The Netherlands*) 332

Proposed use of the Plenary Powers to validate the generic names *Upogebia* Leach, 1814, and *Processa* Leach, 1815 (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda). By L. B. Holthuis (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The Netherlands*) 334

Proposed validation, under the Plenary Powers, of the family-group names PROCESSIDAE and UPOGEBIINAE (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda). By Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E. (*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*) 340

Comment on the proposed validation under the Plenary Powers of *immigrans* Sturtevant, 1921, as published in the combination *Drosophila immigrans* (Class Insecta, Order Diptera). By Roy A. Harrison (*Entomologist, Plant Diseases Division, Department of Scientific and Industrial Research, Auckland, New Zealand*) .. 342

Comment on the proposed validation under the Plenary Powers of *immigrans* Sturtevant, 1921, as published in the combination *Drosophila immigrans* (Class Insecta, Order Diptera). By E. B. Basden (*Institute of Animal Genetics, Edinburgh, Scotland*) 343

Support for the application to validate the name *immigrans* Sturtevant, 1921, as published in the combination *Drosophila immigrans*. By Erich Martin Hering (*Zoologisches Museum der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin*) 344

Page

Support for the proposed validation under the Plenary Powers of the specific name *immigrans* Sturtevant, 1921, as published in the combination *Drosophila immigrans* (Class Insecta, Order Diptera). By F. Van Emden, D.Sc. (*Commonwealth Institute of Entomology, London*) 345

Support for the proposed validation under the Plenary Powers of the specific name *immigrans* Sturtevant, 1921, as published in the combination *Drosophila immigrans* (Class Insecta, Order Diptera). By John Smart, Ph.D., D.Sc. (*Cambridge University, Department of Zoology, Cambridge*) 346

Objection to the proposed use of the Plenary Powers to suppress the generic name *Caenisites* Buckman (S.S.), 1925 (Class Cephalopoda, Order Ammonoidea). By L. F. Spath, D.Sc., F.R.S. (*British Museum (Natural History), London*) 346

Comment on the proposed use of the Plenary Powers to suppress the generic name *Caenisites* Buckman (S.S.), 1925 (Class Cephalopoda, Order Ammonoidea). By R. V. Melville, M.Sc. (*Geological Survey and Museum, London*) 348

Support for Dr. Arkell's proposal relating to *Caenisites* Buckman (S.S.), 1925 (Class Cephalopoda, Order Ammonoidea). By Helmut Holder (*Institut und Museum für Geologie und Paläontologie der Universität Tübingen, Germany*) 349

Support for the proposed suppression under the Plenary Powers of the generic name *Caenisites* Buckman (S.S.), 1925 (Class Cephalopoda, Order Ammonoidea). By P. C. Sylvester-Bradley (*University of Sheffield, Sheffield, England*) 349

Support for Dr. Arkell's proposal relating to *Caenisites* Buckman (S.S.), 1925 (Class Cephalopoda, Order Ammonoidea). By Otto H. Haas (*The American Museum of Natural History, New York*) 350

Support for Dr. Arkell's proposal for a *Declaration* that a generic or specific name based solely upon the aptychus of an ammonite be excluded from availability under the *Règles*. By C. W. Wright (*London*) 350

Support for Professor Swinnerton's proposal to validate, under the Plenary Powers, the specific name *minimus* Miller (J.S.), 1826, as published in the combination *Belemnites minimus* (Class Cephalopoda, Order Dibranchia). By C. W. Wright (*London*) 350

Page

Proposed rejection for the purposes of Rule (g) in Article 30 of the second edition of Curtis (J.), 1837, *A Guide to an Arrangement of British Insects* or alternatively the proposed suppression of the above work under the Plenary Powers for the foregoing purposes. By C. W. Sabrosky (*U.S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Service, Entomology Research Branch, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*) and Richard E. Blackwelder (*United States National Museum, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*) 353

Support for the Sabrosky/Blackwelder proposal that the second (1837) edition of Curtis's *Guide to an Arrangement of British Insects* be rejected for the purposes of Article 30. By Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E. (*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*) 355

Corrigenda 357

Index to authors of applications and of comments on applications .. 359

Subject Index 369

Particulars of dates of publication of the several Parts in which the present volume was published 441

Instructions to binders 442

INTERNATIONAL TRUST
FOR
ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

ACCOUNTS FOR THE YEARS 1952 AND 1953

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF MANAGEMENT OF THE INTERNATIONAL TRUST FOR ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE FOR THE YEAR 1952

(Report approved and adopted by the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature in Annual General Meeting)

The year 1952 by its chequered character illustrates both the achievements which it is possible for the Trust to secure even without an assured income and also the embarrassments to which it is liable to be exposed by reason of being forced to rely for its operations almost entirely upon the income which it obtains from the sale of its publications. On the positive side the year was marked by a successful drive to secure the publication in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* of a large instalment of applications awaiting attention by the Commission. This is an aspect of the work of the Commission to which great importance is attached by the Trust, for the throwing-open of an application for discussion in this way constitutes a most important stage in its consideration and paves the way in most cases for the taking by the Commission of a decision six months later on the problem submitted to it for decision. The unsatisfactory feature of the year 1952 is that in it expenditure exceeded income and it was necessary therefore to draw upon the Trust's reserves to meet the deficit so disclosed. Fortunately, as will be seen later in the present Report, this deficit was accompanied by circumstances which mitigated part of its seriousness. Nevertheless, the fact that there should have been any deficit is much to be regretted and demonstrates once again in an acute form the need for providing adequate funds for the discharge by the Commission of the duties entrusted to it.

2. **Scope of the publications issued in 1952 :** In 1952 the Trust continued the policy inaugurated in the previous year of pressing on with the publication in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* of applications on individual nomenclatorial problems submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for decision. At the same time the Trust took the first important step in connection with the preparations for the Session of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to be held at Copenhagen in July 1953 in connection with the Fourteenth International Congress of Zoology, devoting for this purpose a whole volume of the *Bulletin*. On the first part of this programme the Trust published seven Parts (Parts 5 to 11) of volume 6 of the *Bulletin*, thereby completing that volume, except for the concluding (Index) Part and in addition published five Parts (Parts 1 to 5) of volume 9. The Parts so published contained 74 applications. It will be seen therefore that during the year the Trust advanced a large mass of applications to the point at which, after the prescribed waiting period of six months the Commission will be in a position to take decisions preparatory to the adoption

of a further large instalment of *Opinions*. The Trust attaches great importance to the furtherance of this side of the work of the Commission, since, if the judicial functions of that body are to command universal respect, it is essential that its procedure should be such as to enable it to reach decisions without the long delays which have often occurred in the past. In the year under review the Trust published also the concluding (Index) Part (Part 12) of volume 1 of the *Bulletin*. For the detailed indexes contained in this Part the Trust is indebted to Miss Joan Kelley, B.Sc., who during the year joined the staff of the Commission in a part-time capacity in charge of the Indexes Branch. Under the second part of its Publications Programme for 1952 the Trust devoted a whole volume (volume 7) of the *Bulletin* to a series of detailed surveys prepared by Mr. Francis Hemming, Secretary to the Commission, of seven major problems relating to the text of the *Règles* which the Paris (1948) Congress had decided should be the subject of special study with a view to the submission of Reports, with recommendations, to the next (Copenhagen, 1953) Congress. The purpose of these surveys was to call attention to the issues on which decisions would be sought from the Copenhagen Congress and to elicit the views of interested specialists as to the nature of the decisions so to be taken. In addition, there were included in this volume notes on twenty-eight individual nomenclatorial problems which had also been deferred by the Paris Congress, the purpose of these notes being to seek comments on the issues involved for the consideration of the Commission when it came to take decisions on the various questions concerned. Already also during the year 1952 the Trust decided to allocate a further complete volume for the publication of comments received on the problems discussed in volume 7 and of proposals on other matters relating to the text of the *Règles* which would need to be considered by the Copenhagen Congress in 1953. The volume so earmarked was volume 8 and it was because that volume had been set aside for this purpose that, as already explained, the new volume containing applications for decisions on individual cases which was started during 1952 was allotted the volume number " 9 ", instead of the volume number " 8 ". The total number of pages published during 1952 amounted to 646 pages (vol. 2, 86 pp. and 26 pp. of preliminary matter ; vol. 6, 352 pp. ; vol. 7, 230 pp. and 4 pp. of preliminary matter ; vol. 9, 158 pp.). At this level the output of publications in 1952 was slightly greater than in 1951, when the number of pages published amounted to 608. No *Opinions* or *Declarations* were published in 1952, but, as has already been explained, the large number of applications published in the *Bulletin* during the year provided the basis for a large number of publications of this class as soon as the Commission was in a position to resume this side of its work.

3. **Income from the sale of publications :** The income obtained from the sale of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* (including the sale of back Parts) amounted in 1952 to £2,465 15s. 5d. At this level income under this head exceeded that obtained in any previous year with the exception of 1950, the year in which were published the three volumes (vols. 3, 4 and 5) of the *Bulletin*

containing the Official Record of the Proceedings of the Commission at its Paris Session which had been in preparation since 1948 and had for the most part been printed in 1949. The income obtained under this head in 1952 exceeded that similarly obtained in 1951 (£1,968 13s. 2d.) by £497 2s. 3d. As already explained, no *Opinions* or *Declarations* were published in 1952, but sales of back Parts of these publications amounted during the year to £31 14s. 5d., a figure slightly greater than the amount (£30 6s. 10d.) obtained in 1951. The total income from the sale of publications in 1952 thus amounted to £2,497 9s. 10d. or £498 9s. 10d. more than the amount secured under this head in 1951.

4. **Donations and Grants Received** : During the year under review the Trust received a grant of £357 from U.N.E.S.C.O. through the International Union for Biological Sciences, and a donation of £25 from the Royal Entomological Society of London. To both these institutions the Trust is happy to offer its grateful thanks. The total sum received under this head in 1952 (£382) exceeded the amount (£167 10s. 10d.) in 1951 by £214 9s. 2d.

5. **Total Income in 1952** : The total income of the Trust in 1952, made up of the foregoing items, amounted to £2,879 9s. 10d. or £712 19s. 10d. more than in 1951.

6. **Administrative Expenses** : During the year 1952 administrative expenses amounted to £569 2s. 3d., an increase of £42 13s. 4d. over the expenditure (£526 8s. 11d.) incurred under this head in 1951. Expenditure on the salary of the part-time Publications Officer (£206 17s. 7d.) showed an increase of £29 11s. 5d. over 1951, while payments to part-time typists, which in 1951 amounted to £17 9s. 4d., rose in 1952 to £66 3s. 8d., an increase of £48 14s. 4d. The former of these increases was due mainly to a small increase made by the Trust as from 1st April 1952 in the salary paid to the part-time Publications Officer and, in part also, to a special gratuity paid to that officer at the end of the year in recognition of the great increase in the volume of work which she had been called upon to perform in 1952 as the result of the growth of sales of the Trust's publications, and of the zealous manner in which she had performed her duties. The substantial increase in 1952 in the payments made to part-time typists as compared with 1951 was due to the fact that already by the autumn of 1952 special arrangements had to be made for the copying of the large number of documents received on matters connected with the meeting of the International Commission and of the International Congress of Zoology at Copenhagen in July 1953, for it was evident that, if, as was proposed, all these documents were to be published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* in the special volume (vol. 8) which, as already explained, the Trust had earlier in the year decided to allot to the documents required for the Copenhagen Agenda, it would be necessary to begin the publication of that volume early in 1953. Office Expenses in 1952 amounted to £275 1s. 0d., or practically the same figure as in 1951 (£281 13s. 5d.). No

expenditure was incurred on official travelling in 1952. The fee paid by the Trust to its Auditor (£21) remained unchanged.

7. **Depreciation of Office Equipment** : During 1952 the sum of £20 9s. 5d. was devoted to covering depreciation of office equipment. The increase (£4 7s. 3d.) shown under this head is attributable to the fact that in 1952 it was necessary to buy an extra typewriter for the office of the Commission. The cost of this purchase is reflected in the increase shown in the Balance Sheet of the book value at cost of office equipment purchased since July 1948.

8. **Expenditure on printing scientific publications** : Expenditure on the printing of scientific publications in the year 1952 amounted to the sum of £2,828 17s. 3d. The whole of this expenditure was in respect of printing the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*. This represents an increase over that so incurred in 1951 (£1,404 6s. 10d.) of £1,424 10s. 5d. Although this is an increase of more than 100 per cent. over 1951, it is important that it should be realised that the expenditure incurred in 1952 represents no more than the outlay involved in printing the quantity of publications which it was possible for the part-time Honorary Secretary to see through the press during the course of the year. It does not in any sense represent, and is indeed much less than, the annual outlay which would be required if the Commission possessed a staff adequate to meet the needs of its work and if in consequence it were possible to publish all applications as soon as they were ready and also to publish *Opinions* immediately after decisions had been taken on the questions involved.

9. **Total Expenditure in 1952** : Total expenditure in 1952, made up of the items shown in the preceding paragraphs, amounted to £3,418 8s. 11d. At this level expenditure exceeded that in 1951 by £1,471 11s. As will be seen from the particulars already given, almost the whole of this increase is attributable to the vigorous Publications Policy pursued by the Trust in the year under review.

10. **Balance carried down** : Total Expenditure in 1952 (£3,418 8s. 11d.) exceeded total Income (£2,879 9s. 10d.) by £538 19s. 1d., which was accordingly carried down. At the beginning of the year the Income and Expenditure Account Balance stood at £2,767 7s. 8d. At 31st December 1952 this was reduced by the amount of the adverse balance brought down to £2,228 8s. 7d.

11. **Balance Sheet as at 31st December 1952** : At 31st December 1952 Revenue Reserves amounted to £2,748 6s. 11d. These Reserves consisted of the Income and Expenditure Account Balance to which reference has already been made, of the "Official List" Suspense Account (£422 1s. 8d.) and of the Office Equipment Reserve (£97 16s. 8d.). The last two items were the same as at 31st December 1951, while, as already explained, the first of these items was less by the amount by which in 1952 expenditure exceeded income (£538 19s. 1d.) than the level at which this Balance stood at the end of 1951.

Other liabilities consisted of the provision of £1,000 made in previous years for the publication of the revised edition of the *Règles Internationales de la Nomenclature Zoologique*, and the liabilities in respect of sundry creditors (£1,522 14s. 9d.). Total liabilities at the end of 1952 thus amounted to £5,271 1s. 8d. On the other side of the Balance Sheet, the fixed assets belonging to the Trust, valued at cost less depreciation, stood in the books at £184 5s. 0d. This represents an increase of £39 5s. 7d. over the position at 31st December 1951, and reflects the expenditure incurred during 1952 on the purchase of a new typewriter, less the amount by which during the year the total fixed assets were written off on account of depreciation. Current assets at the end of 1952 amounted to £5,086 16s. 8d. This latter sum consisted of two items. The first of these was a sum of £675, which represented the estimated value of the amounts due to the Trust in respect of publications sold, but not already paid for, by 31st December 1952. As in previous years, the estimate made for this item was based upon the book value of the sales in question, from which an appropriate deduction was made in respect of possible bad debts. The level at which this item stood in the Balance Sheet at the end of 1952 exceeded that at the end of 1951 (£250) by the large sum of £425. This increase was attributable not to any relaxation in the efforts made by the Trust to secure prompt payment of monies due to it but to the fact that two large Parts of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* (vol. 2, Part 12 and vol. 9, Part 4/5) were published so late in December 1952 that payments by subscribers could not be expected before the close of the year. The second item consisted of the sum of £4,411 16s. 8d., being the balances at the bank and cash in hand at the end of 1952.

12. Situation disclosed by the Accounts for 1952 : The situation disclosed by the Accounts for the year 1952 is encouraging in the sense that the great increase in income from the sale of the Trust's publications, representing, as it does, not so much an increase in the volume of sales as a great increase in the total output achieved, affords gratifying evidence of the success of the efforts made to advance the consideration of a large number of applications now awaiting attention by the Commission. From the financial point of view however the situation disclosed by the Accounts affords an unpleasant reminder of the extremely precarious basis on which through lack of an assured income the Trust is forced to conduct its operations. In all essential respects the year 1952 was similar to the year 1951 but in the current year a net loss was incurred on the Trust's Income and Expenditure Account, whereas in 1951 a profit was secured. This was entirely due to the different course taken by the production and sale of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*. In 1951 the Publications Programme was set at a relatively low level, the last Part to be published appeared well before the end of the year and at 31st December the amount of work in progress in the hands of the printer was small. In consequence, virtually the whole of the expenditure incurred on the *Bulletin* in that year was immediately remunerative in the sense that income from the sale of the units published was obtained during the year under account. In the year 1952, however, the position was quite different. The Publications Programme was set at a much higher level and sales were correspondingly higher. Throughout the year there was a steady flow of papers for the *Bulletin* passing to the printer and the year ended with a large amount of work in progress. This block of work represented a liability incurred by the Trust to its printer and it was necessary therefore to include the amount involved in the Income and Expenditure Account as part of the expenditure incurred on the production of the *Bulletin.* Such expenditure is recovered at the time when publication takes place but, when it is incurred in one year and publication does not take place until the following year, it represents a purely nugatory expenditure in the year in which it is incurred, for no return is obtained for in that year. It will be seen therefore that the loss shown in the Income and Expenditure Account for 1952 is largely formal in character. Nevertheless, the fact that it is necessary to record a loss in the foregoing Account for 1952 is very unsatisfactory. It brings into striking relief the difficulties involved in attempting to maintain the output of publications at a high level without an assured income sufficient to make it unnecessary to rely upon sales for the day-to-day financing of current work.

13. Prospect for the Year 1953 : Looking forward to the year 1953, the Trust finds itself confronted with a difficult prospect. For the last four years zoologists and palaeontologists in all parts of the world have been anxiously awaiting the meeting at Copenhagen in 1953 of the Fourteenth International Congress of Zoology at which it is hoped that decisions will be taken on the questions relating to the reform of the *Règles* which were left unsettled by the Paris Congress of 1948. Already the Trust has taken important measures in preparation for the Copenhagen Congress, notably by publishing a whole volume (volume 7) of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* specially devoted to the major problems of nomenclature which are to be discussed by that Congress and by earmarking a further volume (volume 8) for the publication of other documents which have been submitted for consideration at that meeting. If, however, these and other documents are to be handled in an orderly fashion at Copenhagen and generally acceptable solutions are to be devised, it will be essential that detailed preparations should be taken in advance to this end. So great is the importance of these considerations that the Trust has in mind to convene a special Colloquium on Zoological Nomenclature to meet at Copenhagen a week or ten days before the opening of the Congress, in order to provide an opportunity for the dispassionate discussion of the intricate problems on which the Congress will be called upon to take decisions. While in 1953 as in previous years it may be hoped that the cost of publishing the volumes of the *Bulletin* involved will be met by income obtained from sales, it is certain that a heavy expenditure will be involved in organising the proposed Colloquium. The Trust has reason to hope that the International Union for Biological Sciences and U.N.E.S.C.O. will contribute towards the cost of the Colloquium within the limits imposed by their respective budgets, but it is faced nevertheless with the certainty that the expenses in connection with this meeting which it will be necessary for it to meet from its own funds will be substantial and cannot possibly be defrayed from current income. In other words, the arrangements which have been set in train for the completion of the reform of the *Règles* by the Copenhagen Congress are bound to involve an expenditure which it will only be possible for the Trust to meet by drawing upon its small accumulated reserves. The reform of the *Règles* is however a matter of such cardinal importance that the Trust does not doubt that in incurring this expenditure it will have the support of all zoologists. At the same time the Trust is of the opinion that it is essential that the attention of zoologists should be drawn in the most serious manner to the imperative need for providing an assured income for financing the work of the Commission. For if such provision is not made it can only be a matter of time before the whole Commission system will collapse through lack of funds. Even today it is possible to maintain the work of the Commission only by reason of the subsidies in the form of unpaid service and of free office accommodation provided by Mr. Hemming, the Honorary Secretary to the Commission. It is the intention of the Trust to appoint a strong delegation to attend the Copenhagen meetings for the purpose of placing before the zoologists there assembled the need for grappling with the financial and administrative problems involved in maintaining the work of the Commission.

14. Presentation of the Accounts for the Year 1952 and Balance Sheet as at 31st December 1952 : With the foregoing explanations and with the serious warning set out above, the Committee of Management submits herewith to the Trust and, through the Trust, to the general body of zoologists the Accounts for the year 1952 and the Balance Sheet as at 31st December 1952. In doing so, the Committee of Management desires once again to record its thanks to Mr. Francis Hemming, the Honorary Managing Director of the Trust and its Honorary Secretary, for the services rendered by him during the year and also to the Trust's part-time Publications Officer, Mrs. C. Rosner, who has continued to show great interest and assiduity in her duties. Finally, the Committee of Management wishes to thank the Auditors of the Trust, Messrs. W. B. Keen & Co., Chartered Accountants, and their representative, Mr. R. W. M. Taylor, for the constant assistance rendered during the year under review.

Offices of the International Trust
for Zoological Nomenclature,

41 Queen's Gate,

London, S.W.7, England.

INTERNATIONAL TRUST FOR

Incorporated under the Companies

BALANCE SHEET—

1951								
£	£		£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
		Revenue Reserves (per separate accounts)—						
	422	"Official List" Suspense Account	422	1	8			
	98	Office Equipment Reserve	97	16	8			
	2,767	Income and Expenditure Account—Balance ...	2,228	8	7			
3,287	——		———			2,748	6	11
		Provision for Cost of Revision of International Code—						
1,000		"International Code (Publication)" Suspense Account (per separate account)				1,000	0	0
		Liabilities—						
1,815		Sundry Creditors				1,522	14	9
£6,102						£5,271	1	8

We have obtained all the information and explanations which to the best of our knowledge and belief were
from our examination of those books. We have examined the above Balance Sheet and accompanying Income
our information and according to the explanations given us, the said accounts give the information required by the
Trust's affairs at 31st December 1952, and the Income and Expenditure Account gives a true and fair view of the

Finsbury Circus House,
Blomfield Street,
London, E.C.2.
9th April 1953

ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Act 1929 (Limited by Guarantee)

31st DECEMBER 1952

1951 £	£				£ s. d.	£ s. d.
			Fixed Assets—			
			Office Equipment—			
	112		Book Value at 31st December, 1947 (being for the purpose of the Companies Act, 1948 the value at 1st July 1948)		111 17 6	
	98		Additions since at Cost		157 18 3	
	210				269 15 9	
			Less : Depreciation—			
		49	to 31st December 1951 ...	£65 1 4		
		16	for year to date	20 9 5		
	65				85 10 9	
145						184 5 0
			Current Assets—			
	250		Amounts due for Publications, etc., valued at ...		675 0 0	
	5,707		Balance at Bank and Cash in Hand		4,411 16 8	
5,957						5,086 16 8
			(Note :—Stock of Publications not valued)			
£6,102						£5,271 1 8

FRANCIS HEMMING
FRANCIS J. GRIFFIN } Members of the Committee of Management.

necessary for the purposes of our audit. In our opinion proper books of account have been kept, so far as appears and Expenditure Account, which are in agreement with the books of account. In our opinion and to the best of Companies Act 1948 in the manner so required, and the Balance Sheet gives a true and fair view of the state of the Excess of Expenditure over Income for the year ended on that date.

(Signed) W. B. KEEN & CO.,
Chartered Accountants.

Income and Expenditure Account for

INCOME

1951 £	£		£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
		To Sales of publications—						
	30	Opinions and Declarations	31	14	5			
	1,969	Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature ...	2,465	15	5			
1,999						2,497	9	10
25		,, Donation				25	0	0
142		,, Grant from U.N.E.S.C.O. per the International Union for Biological Sciences ...				357	0	0
—		,, Balance carried down being Excess of Expenditure over Income for the year				538	19	1
£2,166						£3,418	8	11

1951 £		£	s.	d.
219	To Balance brought down	—	—	—
2,548	,, Balance at 31st December, 1951 brought forward	2,767	7	8
£2,767		£2,767	7	8

“ Official List ”

1951 £		£	s.	d.
£422	To Balance at 31st December, 1951 brought forward	£422	1	8

Office Equi

1951 £		£	s.	d.
£98	To Balance at 31st December, 1951 brought forward	£97	16	8

“ International Code (Publi

1951 £		£	s.	d.
£1,000	To Balance at 31st December, 1951 brought forward	£1,000	0	0

the year ended 31st December 1952

1951 £	£		EXPENDITURE	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
			By Administration Expenses—			
			Salaries—			
		£177	Publications Officer	206 17 7		
		17	Stenographer Secretary	66 3 8		
	194				273 1 3	
	29		Travelling Expenses		— — —	
	282		Office Expenses		275 1 0	
	21		Audit Fee		21 0 0	
526						569 2 3
16			,, Depreciation of Office Equipment			20 9 5
1,405			,, Publications—Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature			2,828 17 3
219			,, Balance carried down, being Excess of Income over Expenditure for the year			— — —
£2,166						£3,418 8 11
—			By Balance brought down			538 19 1
2,767			,, Balance carried to Balance Sheet			2,228 8 7
£2,767						£2,767 7 8

Suspense Account

		£ s. d.
£422	By Balance carried to Balance Sheet	£422 1 8

nent Reserve

		£ s. d.
£98	By Balance carried to Balance Sheet	£97 16 8

tion) " Suspense Account

		£ s. d.
£1,000	By Balance carried to Balance Sheet	£1,000 0 0

FINANCIAL REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF MANAGEMENT OF THE INTERNATIONAL TRUST FOR ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE FOR THE YEAR 1953

(Report approved and adopted by the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature in Annual General Meeting)

The year 1953 witnessed the culmination of the preparations for the Colloquium on Zoological Nomenclature which in 1951 the Trust had decided to convene to meet at Copenhagen in July 1953 for the purpose of examining in detail all proposals submitted for the reform of those portions of the *Règles*, the consideration of which had been deferred by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 1948, for decision by the next (Fourteenth) International Congress at its meeting at Copenhagen in the year under review. It was always realised that the organisation and holding of a large international gathering such as the Colloquium and the publication of the decisions to be taken by the Congress in the light of the recommendations submitted to it by the International Commission in the light of the conclusions reached by the Colloquium would involve a heavy expenditure far beyond the capacity of the Trust to bear from current income and that it would only be possible for it to meet this expenditure by granting a subsidy towards the cost of the Colloquium from the Trust's general reserves. This anticipation proved to be fully justified.

2. **Form of Account adopted for presenting particulars of the expenditure incurred on the Colloquium on Zoological Nomenclature, Copenhagen, 1953 :** Special consideration has been given by the Committee of Management as to the form of account in which particulars of the expenditure incurred by the Trust on the Colloquium on Zoological Nomenclature can most conveniently be presented. Either of two possible courses could have been adopted. First, it would have been possible to include in the Trust's Income and Expenditure Account a single item showing the net expenditure incurred by the Trust on the Colloquium, the item so entered being supplemented by a separate statement giving detailed particulars showing the elements of which that item was composed. The second course would have been to distribute the various items concerned between the sub-heads adopted in the main Income and Expenditure Account under which the expenditure of the classes concerned are normally shown. The Committee of Management has adopted the first of these courses, partly because it provides a better and more detailed picture of the expenditure incurred on the Colloquium and partly because, by separating that expenditure from the normal expenditure incurred in the year under review, it affords a basis for comparing this latter expenditure with corresponding expenditure in previous years which would otherwise have been lacking.

3. Scope of the Publications issued in 1953 : Throughout the year 1953 the entire resources of the Office of the Commission were devoted, first, to the completion of the preparations for the Colloquium arranged to be held at Copenhagen in July of that year and, later, to the editing and publication of the volume containing the Official Record of the decisions on zoological nomenclature taken at Copenhagen by the Fourteenth International Congress of Zoology following the close of the meetings of the Colloquium. In consequence, no items belonging to the " Opinions " Series and no Parts of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* containing applications on individual cases submitted for decision were published in 1953. In the seven-month period January—July there was published however a large number of Parts of the *Bulletin* devoted to one aspect or another of the Agenda for the Copenhagen Colloquium. In addition, the last day of the year witnessed the publication of the work entitled *Copenhagen Decisions on Zoological Nomenclature* which contained the Official Record of the decisions taken by the Copenhagen Congress.

4. Publication in the " Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature " of the Agenda for the Colloquium on Zoological Nomenclature summoned to meet at Copenhagen in July 1953 : It was decided in 1952 to devote a whole volume of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* to the publication of the documents to be submitted to the Colloquium on Zoological Nomenclature which the Trust had decided to convene to meet at Copenhagen in July 1953 immediately before the opening of the Fourteenth International Congress of Zoology. The volume so allotted for this purpose was volume 8. Later, the Trust took the view that, if the whole of the large documentation was to be printed in time to be considered before the opening of the Colloquium, it would be desirable to divide the documents so as to form two volumes of the *Bulletin* and to employ different printers for these volumes. Under this decision the documents for the Copenhagen Agenda were divided between volumes 8 and 10 of the *Bulletin*. At various dates in the earlier part of the year 24 Parts of the *Bulletin*, comprising a total of 796 pages, were published in connection with the Copenhagen Meetings. It has been gratifying to the Trust to learn that the ample documentation so provided was warmly welcomed by the zoologists attending the Copenhagen discussions and constituted a material factor in securing the due understanding by the Colloquium, the Commission and the Congress of the complicated issues involved.

5. Publication in December 1953 of the work " Copenhagen Decisions on Zoological Nomenclature " : Immediately after the close in August 1953 of the meeting of the Fourteenth International Congress of Zoology, work was started on the editing of the document recording the outcome of the discussions at Copenhagen. In form that document was a Report by the Colloquium on Zoological Nomenclature to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature. In view however of the fact that all the meetings of the Colloquium were held jointly with the Commission, the Report adopted formed a Report by the Commission as well as by the Colloquium.

This Report was unanimously approved and adopted by the Copenhagen Congress at its Final Plenary Session held on 12th August 1953. While it was not possible to recast this document to constitute a direct record of the decisions taken by the Copenhagen Congress it was decided to publish it under a title which would make it quite clear that the provisions set out in it were not only the recommendations of the Colloquium but were also the Official Record of the decisions taken by the Congress. At the same time it was considered that, as this work would inevitably be widely quoted, it was desirable that it should be given a convenient short title as well as a longer and more explanatory sub-title. It was with these considerations in mind that it was decided to publish this work under the title :—" Copenhagen Decisions on Zoological Nomenclature ", with the sub-title " Additions to, and modifications of, the *Règles Internationales de la Nomenclature Zoologique* approved and adopted by the Fourteenth International Congress of Zoology, Copenhagen, August 1953 ". In view of the importance of placing this work in the hands of zoologists at the earliest possible moment it was decided by the Trust that in the second part of the year all other work should be put on one side in order that the preparations for its publication should be pressed forward with the utmost despatch. At the same time the Trust engaged the good offices of its printers, Messrs. Metcalfe & Cooper Ltd., to expedite the actual process of printing to the full extent practicable. As the result of these efforts this book was published very rapidly, appearing on 31st December 1953, i.e. within a period of four and a half months of the date on which it was approved by the Copenhagen Congress.

6. **The price fixed for the work " Copenhagen Decisions on Zoological Nomenclature "** : In the past it has sometimes been argued that if only the Trust were to issue its publications at low prices and in large editions the demand would be so stimulated that a financial loss would be avoided. The Trust however has always taken the view that the subject matter of its publications is so specialised that demand is extremely inelastic and therefore that the adoption of a policy of the kind described above would be bound to lead to substantial financial loss. The Trust has felt however for some time that this was a matter which ought to be put to the test at the first convenient opportunity. When considering the question of the price to be charged for the *Copenhagen Decisions*, the Trust took the view that no more favourable opportunity could be found for testing the elasticity of demand for publications on zoological nomenclature, for, in view of the fact that this work was concerned with important developments in the *Règles*, it was certain to excite much wider interest than either the *Bulletin* or an *Opinion* dealing with some specialised problem relating to nomenclature in a particular group in the Animal Kingdom. The Trust accordingly decided to fix the price of this book at the nominal figure of five shillings. This figure was deliberately selected in order to determine the number of copies of an important work on zoological nomenclature which it would be possible to sell if that work were to be placed on the market at a very low price. It remains to be seen by how much demand will be stimulated by the price charged and therefore the amount by which sales will exceed

the normal level for Parts of the *Bulletin* and for *Opinions*. Even if, as the Trust expects, sales, though noticeably higher than the ordinary level, fail to reach a total sufficient to recoup the printing costs involved, the publication of this particular work at this cut price will have served a useful purpose by bringing the decisions of the Copenhagen Congress before a wider circle of zoologists than would otherwise have been possible.

7. Income from sales of publications : During the year 1953 income from the sale of the current volumes (volumes 8 and 10) of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*, supplemented to some extent by the sale of back sets, amounted to £2,754 2s. 3d., an increase of £288 6s. 10d. over the amount secured in 1952. Income from the sales of " Opinions " amounted only to £8 6s. 8d., a decline of £23 7s. 9d. as compared with the previous year. It seems evident that further substantial sales of this series, the last item of which (*Opinion* 194) was published as long ago as 1947, are not to be expected until the publication of a further instalment of *Opinions* stimulates the demand for items already published. Sales of the *Copenhagen Decisions* amounted to £28 8s. 10d. Total income from the sale of publications during the year thus amounted to £2,790 17s. 9d.

8. Donation received from the Royal Entomological Society of London : The Trust desires gratefully to acknowledge the receipt during the year of a gift of £25 from the Royal Entomological Society of London and at the same time to express its appreciation of the manner in which over a long period of years this Society has shown its interest in the work of the International Commission not only by making annual gifts to the Trust but also by itself submitting numerous applications to the Commission for stabilising the names of important genera of insects on the British List.

9. Gift received from Mr. Francis Hemming : During the year Mr. Francis Hemming made available to the Trust a sum of £1,736 11s. 8d. as a contribution to its general funds. Mr. Hemming asked that the money so provided should be used by the Trust for the purpose of clearing-off arrears of work in the Office of the Commission. The Trust desires to express its warmest thanks for this benefaction which is by far the largest single gift ever received for the furtherance of its work.

10. Grant received through the International Union for Biological Sciences from U.N.E.S.C.O. : No grant was made during the year by the International Union for Biological Sciences and U.N.E.S.C.O. towards the general expenses of the Trust but a very valuable contribution amounting to £713 19s. 10d. was received from this source towards the cost of organising the Colloquium on Zoological Nomenclature convened by the Trust to meet at Copenhagen in July 1953 immediately prior to the opening of the Fourteenth International Congress of Zoology. As explained in paragraph 2 of the present Report, it has been considered that it would be more informative if a separate statement were to be submitted showing the expenditure incurred in connection with the Colloquium, the same statement showing also the sources of the funds from which this expenditure was met. Accordingly for the purposes of the main Income and Expenditure Account for the year under review, the gross expenditure incurred on the Colloquium has been shown as a single item of expenditure, the net expenditure incurred by the Trust being obtained by the deduction from the foregoing figure of the grant received from the International Union (paragraph 15 below).

11. **Total Income in 1953 :** Total Income in 1953, made up of the income obtained from the sale of publications (paragraph 7), the donation received from the Royal Entomological Society of London (paragraph 8) and the benefaction received from Mr. Hemming (paragraph 9), amounted to £4,552 9s. 5d. At this level income exceeded that in 1952 by £1,672 19s. 7d. As will be seen from the particulars given above, this difference is due, apart from the increase in income from sales, to differences between the amounts received by way of gifts in 1952 and 1953 respectively.

12. **Administrative Expenses :** Expenditure incurred on salaries and wages amounted in 1953 to £235 9s. 5d., a reduction of £37 11s. 10d. on the expenditure similarly incurred in 1952. This was due almost entirely to the fact that the copying of documents for inclusion in the Agenda for the Copenhagen Colloquium was approaching completion by the end of 1952 and in consequence the expenditure on typing assistance in 1953 was considerably less than it had been in the previous year. It will be noted also that expenditure on salaries in 1953 included a small sum in respect of salary paid to the Administrative Officer appointed near the close of the year (paragraph 20 below). Normal Office Expenses, that is, expenses other than those incurred in connection with the preparations for the Colloquium, amounted in 1953 to £185 19s. 6d. This represents a reduction of £89 1s. 6d. on the expenditure incurred in 1952. This difference is however mainly formal in character owing to the fact that in 1952 office expenses incurred in connection with the preparations for the Colloquium to be held in 1953 were not shown separately, being included with normal office expenses. Expenditure on postage was also much less in 1953 than in 1952 owing to the much smaller number of Voting Papers issued to Members of the Commission. During the year the Trust approved an increase of ten guineas in the fee paid to its auditors in recognition of the increase in the amount of work involved in the audit owing to the growth in the volume of sales of its publications and, in particular, in the number of individual transactions to be examined. Expenditure incurred under this head in 1953 accordingly amounted to £31 10s. 0d. Total Administrative Expenses thus amounted in 1953 to the sum of £452 18s. 11d. For the reasons explained above, this was less than the expenditure similarly incurred in 1952 by the sum of £116 3s. 4d.

13. **Depreciation of Office Equipment :** During the year 1953 the sum of £18 8s. 6d. was appropriated towards depreciation of office equipment. This was slightly less than the amount (£20 9s. 5d.) so appropriated in 1952.

14. **Expenditure on printing scientific publications :** Expenditure on the printing of scientific publications in 1953 fell under two heads :—(1) expenditure on printing further instalments in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* of applications submitted to the Commission for decision ; (2) expenditure incurred in the printing of (a) the volumes of the *Bulletin* (volumes 8 and 10) containing the Agenda for the Copenhagen Meetings and (b) the work *Copenhagen Decisions on Zoological Nomenclature*, the volume containing the Official Record of the decisions taken by the Fourteenth International Congress of Zoology, Copenhagen, 1953. The expenditure incurred under this latter head is included in the general Copenhagen item in the accounts (paragraph 15 below). Thus, the only item in respect of the printing of scientific publications shown in the main Income and Expenditure Account is one of £684 10s. 11d., which was entirely in respect of work in hand in connection with the printing of normal instalments of the *Bulletin*. If it had not been for the decision to include in the Copenhagen Account the expenditure incurred on the Colloquium volumes of the *Bulletin*, the total expenditure on the production of the *Bulletin* in 1953 would have appeared as £2,728 16s. 2d. At this level expenditure on the *Bulletin* in 1953 fell short of that in 1952 by almost exactly £100.

15. **Net expenditure incurred on the Colloquium on Zoological Nomenclature, Copenhagen, 1953 :** The total gross expenditure incurred in connection with the Colloquium on Zoological Nomenclature held at Copenhagen in July—August 1953 amounted to £3,482 2s. 9d. Towards this expenditure the Trust received a grant through the International Union for Biological Sciences from U.N.E.S.C.O. of $2,000 which realised the sum of £713 19s. 10d. The net expenditure incurred on the Colloquium by the Trust from its own funds thus amounted to £2,768 2s. 11d. Full particulars of this expenditure are shown in the Colloquium Statement annexed to the Accounts. By far the largest single item of expenditure was that incurred on printing, which amounted to £2,664 10s. 6d. This consisted (a) of a sum of £2,044 5s. 3d. incurred on the printing of the two volumes (volumes 8 and 10) of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* containing the Agenda for the Copenhagen Meetings, and (b) of an item of £620 5s. 3d. incurred on the production of the work *Copenhagen Decisions on Zoological Nomenclature*. In addition, a sum of £183 16s. 9d. was expended in the production of mimeographed documents for use by the Colloquium. Some of these documents were prepared in London prior to the opening of the Colloquium but most of them were prepared in Copenhagen during the meetings of that body. These latter documents were for the most part both written and reproduced at night in order that they might be available for the morning meeting of the Colloquium on the following day. The Trust is much indebted to the Typing Agencies in Copenhagen for their co-operation in

securing that the documents concerned were always available for the meeting at which they were required. The grant received from the International Union for Biological Sciences provided that in approved cases it might be used for making grants in respect of locomotion expenses incurred by zoologists attending the Colloquium. Use of the authority so granted was made only sparingly by the Trust, the total number of grants made amounting only to five. In four cases, these took the form of lump sum payments, while in the fifth, which was made on compassionate grounds, the grant made represented actual locomotion expenses between the United States and Copenhagen. The total sum expended on these grants amounted to £277 18s. 4d. The remaining items are all concerned with the establishment and maintenance of a temporary Office for the Commission and the Trust at Copenhagen during the sittings of the Colloquium. This group of items include payment of salary to a Staff Officer specially engaged for the duration of the Colloquium, a fee to a translator for translations of the correspondence reproduced in Part 2 of the work *Copenhagen Decisions*, casual typing assistance, subsistence allowance paid to the staff of the Secretariat while in Copenhagen, locomotion expenses between London and Copenhagen, stationery and office requisites purchased in Copenhagen, postage and minor miscellaneous items.

16. Balance carried down : Total Income in 1954, including the gift made by Mr. Hemming, amounted to £4,552 9s. 5d. and Total Expenditure to £3,924 1s. 3d. The accounts accordingly show an Excess of Income over Expenditure amounting to £628 8s. 2d. which was carried down. For the purposes of comparison with previous years it would be reasonable to exclude from account the gift received from Mr. Hemming, both because of its large size and because of the wish expressed by the donor that this gift should be used for clearing-off arrears of normal work in the Office of the Commission. Accordingly, if the sum in question (£1,736 11s. 8d.) is ignored for the present purposes, normal income in 1953 is seen to have amounted only to £2,815 17s. 9d. Thus, if it had not been for the gift referred to above, there would have been an excess of expenditure over income of £1,108 3s. 6d. in 1953 instead of the excess of income over expenditure of £628 8s. 2d. shown in the accounts. In other words, the total net contribution made by the Trust to the expenses of the Colloquium (£2,768 2s. 11d.) could have been met by the Trust to the extent of £1,660 9s. 5d. out of its income for the year, while for the remainder (£1,108 3s. 6d.) it would have been necessary for the Trust to draw upon its Reserves.

17. Balance carried to Balance Sheet : The balance at 31st December 1953 of the Trust's Income and Expenditure Account amounted to £2,228 8s. 7d. At the end of the year this figure was increased by the excess of income over expenditure (£628 8s. 2d.) to £2,856 16s. 9d. During the year however the Trust had approved an increase of ten guineas in the fee payable to its Auditors not only for the current year (paragraph 12 above) but also retrospectively for the year 1952. Accordingly, the Balance of the Trust's Income and Expenditure Account carried to the Balance Sheet as at 31st December 1953 amounted to £2,846 6s. 9d.

18. Expenditure from the "International Code (Publication)" Suspense Account : During the year 1953 a sum of £188 1s. 6d. was paid from the "International Code (Publication)" Suspense Account to the draftsmen by whom had been prepared the draft of the *Règles* as revised by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 1948. The balance in this Account which at the beginning of the year had stood at £1,000 was thus reduced to £811 18s. 6d.

19. Balance Sheet as at 31st December 1953 : At 31st December 1953 the Trust's total Revenue Reserves amounted to £3,366 5s. 1d. This sum was made up of :—(a) the "Official List" Suspense Account, balance, £422 1s. 8d. ; (b) Office Equipment Reserve, £97 16s. 8d. ; (c) Income and Expenditure Account, balance, £2,846 6s. 9d. (paragraph 17 above). At the same date the provision made for the publication of the revised text of the *Règles* amounted to £811 18s. 6d. (paragraph 18 above). In addition, liabilities to sundry creditors (mostly to the Trust's printers) amounted to £2,029 17s. 10d. On the other side of the Balance Sheet, Fixed Assets, less depreciation, were valued at £165 16s. 6d., while Current Assets amounted to £6,042 4s. 11d. This latter item consisted of sums due to the Trust for publications valued at £193, and of the balance at the bank and cash in hand amounting to £5,849 4s. 11d.

20. Retrospect and Prospect : The year 1953 was one of great achievement in the field of zoological nomenclature, for in it the Congress at Copenhagen completed the revision of the *Règles* begun by the Paris Congress in 1948. For the success so achieved the Trust may claim credit both for having made the preparations and other arrangements which rendered that success possible and for having published the volume containing the decisions of the Copenhagen Congress within a few months of the close of that meeting. The long period of preparation for the Congress and the consequent preoccupation with problems relating to the text of the *Règles* has necessarily led to delays in dealing with individual applications submitted to the Commission for decision. In particular, there has been a long period in which no *Opinions* have been published, although the Commission has taken a large number of decisions on individual cases which are awaiting promulgation in *Opinions*. It is the intention of the Trust to concentrate upon this side of the work of the Commission in 1954. The large gift made to the Trust by Mr. Hemming for the purpose principally of dealing with arrears will enable the Trust to engage salaried staff to whom it will be possible for Mr. Hemming, as Secretary, to delegate a considerable part of the work which he has hitherto had to undertake and thus make it possible for him to concentrate his attention on the portion of the work which must be performed by him personally. A start in this direction was made by the appointment in December 1953 of Mrs. Sheila Watkins to the newly established post of Administrative Officer. Already Mrs. Watkins has made her presence felt by relieving Mr. Hemming of various administrative duties, and this in turn has made it possible for him to complete a first instalment of *Opinions* embodying hitherto unpromulgated decisions taken by the Commission. The volume of work so performed may be judged by the fact that during the last eight months of the year Mr. Hemming, while remaining an Honorary Officer, has nevertheless been working regularly on a whole-time basis.

21. Presentation of the Accounts for the Year 1953 and Balance Sheet as at 31st December 1953 : With the foregoing explanations, the Committee of Management has pleasure in presenting to the Trust the Accounts for the Year 1953 and the Balance Sheet as at 31st December 1953. Mr. Francis Hemming has continued to discharge the duties of Managing Director and Secretary in an honorary capacity and the Trust is much indebted to him for the services so rendered which have been exceptionally onerous in the year under review, involving, as they have, the making of all the complex arrangements involved in holding the Colloquium on Zoological Nomenclature at Copenhagen and the establishment in that city of a temporary office for the duration of the Congress. The Trust is much indebted also to Mrs. C. Rosner, its Publications Officer, who has handled the greatly increased volume of work in the Publications Office with her accustomed care and enthusiasm. Finally, it is desired to express on behalf of the Trust, its sense of obligation to its Auditors, Messrs. W. B. Keen & Co., Chartered Accountants, and to their representative, Mr. R. W. M. Taylor, for the help and advice which they have at all times been ready to give during the year under review.

Offices of the International Trust
for Zoological Nomenclature,
41 Queen's Gate,
London, S.W.7, England.

INTERNATIONAL TRUST FOR

Incorporated under the Companies

Balance Sheet—

1952 £	£		£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
		Revenue Reserves (per separate accounts)—						
	422	"Official List" Suspense Account	422	1	8			
	98	Office Equipment Reserve	97	16	8			
	2,228	Income and Expenditure Account—Balance ...	2,846	6	9			
2,748						3,366	5	1
		Provision for Cost of Revision of International Code—						
1,000		"International Code (Publication)" Suspense Account (per separate account)				811	18	6
		Liabilities—						
1,523		Sundry Creditors				2,029	17	10
£5,271						£6,208	1	5

We have obtained all the information and explanations which to the best of our knowledge and belief were
from our examination of those books. We have examined the above Balance Sheet and accompanying Income
our information and according to the explanations given us, the said accounts give the information required by the
Trust's affairs at 31st December 1953, and the Income and Expenditure Account gives a true and fair view of the

Finsbury Circus House,
Blomfield Street,
London, E.C.2.

24th August 1954.

ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Act 1929 (Limited by Guarantee)

31st December 1953

1952 £	£				£ s. d.	£ s. d.
			Fixed Assets—			
			Office Equipment—			
	112		Book Value at 1st July 1948		111 17 6	
	157		Additions since at cost		157 18 3	
	269				269 15 9	
			Less Depreciation—			
		£65	to 31st December 1952 ...	£85 10 9		
		20	for year to date	18 8 6		
	85	—			103 19 3	
184						165 16 6
			Current Assets—			
	675		Amounts due for Publications etc. Valued at ...		193 0 0	
	4,412		Balance at Bank and Cash in Hand		5,849 4 11	
5,087						6,042 4 11

(Note :—Stock of Publications not valued)

FRANCIS HEMMING
FRANCIS J. GRIFFIN
} Members of the Committee of Management.

1952 £						£ s. d.
£5,271						£6,208 1 5

necessary for the purposes of our audit. In our opinion proper books of account have been kept, so far as appears and Expenditure Account, which are in agreement with the books of account. In our opinion and to the best of Companies Act 1948 in the manner so required, and the Balance Sheet gives a true and fair view of the state of the Excess of Income over Expenditure for the year ended on that date.

(Signed) W. B. KEEN & CO.,
Chartered Accountants.

Income and Expenditure Account for

1952 £	£	INCOME	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
		To Sales of Publications—						
	31	Opinions and Declarations	8	6	8			
	2,466	Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature ...	2,754	2	3			
	—	Copenhagen Decisions on Zoological Nomenclature	28	8	10			
2,497						2,790	17	9
25		,, Donations				1,761	11	8
357		,, Grant from U.N.E.S.C.O. per the International Union for Biological Sciences ...				—	—	—
539		,, Balance carried down being Excess of Expenditure over Income for year				—	—	—
£3,418						£4,552	9	5
—		To Balance brought down				628	8	2
2,767		,, Balance at 31st December 1952 brought forward				2,228	8	7
£2,767						£2,856	16	9

“ Official List ”

£422	To Balance at 31st December 1952 brought forward	£422	1	8

Office Equip

£98	To Balance at 31st December 1952 brought forward	£97	16	8

“ International Code (Public

1,000	To Balance at 31st December 1952 brought forward	1,000	0	0
£1,000		£1,000	0	0

the Year ended 31st December 1953

1952 £	£		EXPENDITURE	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
			By Administration Expenses—			
			Salaries—			
		£207	Publications Officer	205 3 8		
		66	Stenographer Secretary ...	19 16 9		
		—	Administrative Officer ...	10 9 0		
	273				235 9 5	
	275		Office Expenses		185 19 6	
	21		Audit Fee		31 10 0	
569						452 18 11
20			Depreciation of Office Equipment			18 8 6
2,829			Publications—Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature			684 10 11
			Colloquium on Zoological Nomenclature, Copenhagen—			
			Expenditure (including printing Agenda and Decisions)		3,482 2 9	
—			*Less* Donations per the International Union for Biological Sciences		713 19 10	
						2,768 2 11
—			Balance carried down being Excess of Income over Expenditure for year ...			628 8 2
£3,418						£4,552 9 5

		£ s. d.
539	By Balance brought down	— — —
—	,, Additional Audit Fee 1952	10 10 0
2,228	,, Balance carried to Balance Sheet	2,846 6 9
£2,767		£2,856 16 9

Suspense Account

£422	By Balance carried to Balance Sheet	£422 1 8

ment Reserve

£98	By Balance carried to Balance Sheet	£97 16 8

ation) " Suspense Account

—	By Expenditure during year	188 1 6
£1,000	,, Balance carried to Balance Sheet	811 18 6
£1,000		£1,000 0 0

INTERNATIONAL TRUST FOR

Colloquium on Zoological

INCOME

	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
Donations—		
U.N.E.S.C.O. (per the International Union for Biological Sciences)	357 0 0	
The International Union for Biological Sciences	356 19 10	
		713 19 10
Contribution by the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature		2,768 2 11
		£3,482 2 9

We have examined the foregoing statement with the books and vouchers

Finsbury Circus House,
Blomfield Street,
London, E.C.2.
24th August 1954.

ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Nomenclature—Copenhagen 1953

EXPENDITURE

	£.	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Salaries and Fees—						
Staff Officer	28	11	4			
Translator (Fee)...	2	2	0			
Typing Assistance	14	10	6	45	3	10
Subsistence Allowances—						
(Staff of Secretariat)				103	17	0
Locomotion Expenses :						
Aircraft passages (Staff of Colloquium)	114	0	0			
Excess Baggage (documents for Colloquium)	34	16	4			
Cars to and from air terminal and taxicabs between Secretariat and Colloquium	12	18	6	161	14	10
Grants to Members of the Colloquium (travelling and subsistence) ...				277	18	4
Stationery and Office Requisites...				12	3	7
Reproduction of documents for meetings of Colloquium				183	16	9
Postage				5	15	11
Printing :						
Agenda of Colloquium (Bull. zool. Nomencl., vols. 8 and 10) ...	2,044	5	3			
Decisions of Colloquium	620	5	3	2,664	10	6
Official Hospitality				15	14	10
Miscellaneous				11	7	2
				£3,482	2	9

of the Trust and certify it to be in accordance therewith.

(Signed) W. B. KEEN & CO.,
Chartered Accountants.

VOLUME 9. Triple Part 1/3 — 15*th October* 1952
pp. 1-106.

THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

The Official Organ of

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Edited by

FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

CONTENTS :

Page
Editorial Note regarding the arrangements made in regard to the Subjects to be dealt with in volumes 8 and 9 respectively .. 1

Notices prescribed by International Congress of Zoology :

Date of commencement by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of voting on applications published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* 2

Notice of the possible use by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of its plenary powers in certain cases 2

(*continued on back wrapper*)

LONDON :

**Printed by Order of the International Trust for
Zoological Nomenclature
and
Sold on behalf of the International Commission by the
International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature
at the Publications Office of the Trust
41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.
1952**

Price One Pound Thirteen Shillings

(*All rights reserved*)

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

A. The Officers of the Commission

Honorary Life President : Dr. Karl Jordan (United Kingdom)

President : (*Vacant*)

Vice-President & Acting President : Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (Brazil)

Secretary : Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom)

B. The Members of the Commission

(*Arranged in order of precedence by reference to date of election or of most recent re-election, as prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology*)

Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (Brazil) (*Vice-President*) (1st January 1944)
Professor J. R. Dymond (Canada) (1st January 1944)
Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.) (28th March 1944)
Professor Harold E. Vokes (U.S.A.) (23rd April 1944)
Dr. William Thomas Calman (United Kingdom) (1st January 1947)
Professor Bela Hankó (Hungary) (1st January 1947)
Dr. Norman R. Stoll (U.S.A.) (1st January 1947)
Professor H. Boschma (Netherlands) (1st January 1947)
Senor Dr. Angel Cabrera (Argentina) (27th July 1948)
Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) (*Secretary*) (27th July 1948)
Dr. Joseph Pearson (Australia) (27th July 1948)
Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark) (27th July 1948)
Professor Teiso Esaki (Japan) (17th April 1950)
Professor Pierre Bonnet (France) (9th June 1950)
Mr. Norman Denbigh Riley (United Kingdom) (9th June 1950)
Professor Tadeusz Jaczewski (Poland) (15th June 1950)
Professor Robert Mertens (Germany) (5th July 1950)
Professor Erich Martin Hering (Germany) (5th July 1950)

C. The Staff of the Secretariat of the Commission

Honorary Secretary : Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Honorary Personal Assistant to the Secretary : Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming

Honorary Archivist : Mr. Francis J. Griffin, A.L.A.

D. The Staff of the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature

Honorary Secretary and Managing Director : Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Honorary Registrar : Mr. A. S. Pankhurst

Publications Officer : Mrs. C. Rosner

E. The Addresses of the Commission and the Trust

Secretariat of the Commission : 28, Park Village East, Regent's Park, London, N.W.1.

Offices of the Trust : 41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7

PURCHASED
16 OCT 1952

BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Volume 9, Triple-Part 1/3 (pp. 1–106) 15th October 1952

EDITORIAL NOTE REGARDING THE ARRANGEMENTS MADE IN REGARD TO THE SUBJECTS TO BE DEALT WITH IN VOLUMES 8 AND 9 OF THE "BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE" RESPECTIVELY

In view of the fact that the Fourteenth International Congress of Zoology will meet at Copenhagen in about a year's time and that during that meeting the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature will have under consideration, and will submit recommendations to the International Congress regarding, a number of general problems relating to zoological nomenclature, it is considered that it will be for the convenience of zoologists attending the foregoing meetings, if papers on general questions of this kind are grouped together in a single volume of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* rather than being distributed over two or more volumes where they would be intermingled with applications relating to individual names.

2. It has accordingly been decided to reserve Volume 8 of the *Bulletin* for papers on general nomenclatorial problems, this volume thus forming a companion volume to Volume 7, which is also concerned with certain of the general problems to be considered at Copenhagen next year. Within Volume 8 papers relating to the same subject received from various quarters will, so far as possible, be grouped together, thus further facilitating reference and discussion. It is hoped that the publication of this volume will start at an early date.

3. Since Volume 6 (the latest volume devoted to the publication of applications relating to individual nomenclatorial problems) has now been completed (except for Part 12 containing the Title-Page and index, which is now in preparation) and, as explained above, Volumes 7 and 8 are being reserved for general nomenclatorial problems to be discussed at Copenhagen, the present volume (Volume 9) will be devoted to applications on individual names. This volume is therefore in a sense the immediate successor of Volume 6 and will contain also comments received from specialists on applications published in that volume.

4. The present Part is issued as a Triple Part, in order to render it possible to publish as a single unit all the available applications relating to the names of birds which have been received by the Commission. The majority of these have been submitted by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature established in 1950 by the International Ornithological Congress "to consider, on behalf of the International Ornithological Congress, problems arising in ornithological nomenclature, to formulate proposals in regard thereto designed to promote stability and uniformity in nomenclatorial practice, and, in the name of the International Congress, to present proposals, so formulated, to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for favourable consideration." The appointment of this Standing Committee is warmly to be welcomed, representing, as it does, exactly that type of development which the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature had in mind when at Lisbon in 1935 it adopted a Resolution expressing its earnest hope that specialists in particular groups of the Animal Kingdom would organise themselves for the study of nomenclature in their respective groups (see 1943, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 11).

(int'd) F.H.

31st August 1952.

NOTICES PRESCRIBED BY THE INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ZOOLOGY

The following notices are given in pursuance of decisions taken, on the recommendation of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 51-56, 57-59), by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, July 1948 (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **5** : 5-13, 131).

(a) Date of commencement by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of voting on applications published in the " Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature "

Notice is hereby given that normally the International Commission will start to vote upon applications published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* on the expiry of a period of six calendar months from the date of publication in the *Bulletin* of the applications in question. Any specialist who may desire to comment upon any of the applications published in the present Triple-Part (Vol. 9, Triple-Part 1/3) of the *Bulletin* is accordingly invited to do so in writing to the Secretary to the Commission, as quickly as possible and in any case, in sufficient time to enable the communication in question to reach the Secretariat of the Commission before the expiry of the six-month period referred to above.

(b) Notice of the possible use by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of its plenary powers in certain cases

Notice is hereby given that the possible use by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of its plenary powers is involved in

Notices prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology (*continued*)

applications published in the present Part of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* (Vol. 9, Triple-Part 1/3) in relation to the following names of birds :—

(1) *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758, and *Gavia* (all uses prior to *Gavia* Forster, 1788), suppression of (Z.N.(S.)78) ;

(2) *caspicus* Hablizl, 1783 (*Colymbus*), suppression of (Z.N.(S.)525) ;

(3) *cafra* (*Otis*), *cafer* (*Cuculus*), *sulphuratus* (*Cuculus*), *flavescens* (*Lanius*), all of Lichtenstein, 1793, suppression of (Z.N.(S.)526) ;

(4) *nortoniensis* Gmelin, 1789 (*Fringilla*), suppression of (Z.N.(S.)527) ;

(5) *natka* (*Lanius*) and *septentrionalis* (*Lanius*), both of Gmelin, 1788, and *eimeensis* (*Columba*), *unalaschkensis* (*Hirundo*), *borealis* (*Motacilla*), *cirrhatus* (*Pelecanus*), *australis* (*Sterna*), all of Gmelin, 1789, suppression of (Z.N.(S.)454) ;

(6) *phaeus* (*Turdus*), *elegans* (*Motacilla*), *chlorotis* (*Muscicapa*), all of Forster, 1794, and *novaehollandiae* Latham, 1790 (*Muscicapa*), suppression of (Z.N.(S.)494) ;

(7) *Pyrrhocorax* Tunstall, 1771, validation of, for the Chough (Z.N.(S.) 492) ;

(8) *philomelos* Brehm, 1831 (*Turdus*), validation of, for the Song Thrush (Z.N.(S.)493) ;

(9) generic name *Vermivora* and trivial names *lutea* (*Muscicapa*), *pensylvanica* [sic] (*Passer*), *americ.* [sic] (*Vermivora*), all of Linnaeus, 1776, suppression of (Z.N.(S.)502) ;

(10) *Columba migratoria* Linnaeus, 1766, validation of, for the Passenger Pigeon (Z.N.(S.)572) ;

(11) *Bubo* Duméril, 1806, *Coturnix* Bonnaterre, 1790, *Egretta* Forster, 1817, *Oriolus* Linnaeus, 1766, validation of, by suppression of senior homonyms published by Brisson in 1760 (Z.N.(S.)701) ;

(12) *Capella* Frenzel, 1801, validation of, by suppression of *Gallinago* Brisson, 1760 (Z.N.(S.)575) ;

(13) *Myiobius* Darwin, 1839, validation of, and designation of type species for, in harmony with current practice (Z.N.(S.)676) ;

(14) *cyanea* Hume, 1877 (*Muscitrea*), validation of, by suppression of *cyanea* Vieillot, 1818 (*Muscicapa*) (Z.N.(S.)686) ;

(15) *ferruginea* Hodgson, 1845 (*Hemichelidon*), validation of, by suppression of *ferruginea* Merrem, 1784 (*Muscicapa*) (Z.N.(S.)687).

2. In accordance with the arrangement agreed upon at the Session held by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in Paris in 1948 (see *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 56) corresponding Notices have been issued to the serial publications " Nature " and " Science."

FRANCIS HEMMING,
Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

28 Park Village East,
Regent's Park, LONDON, N.W.1.
15*th October* 1952.

ESTABLISHMENT BY THE TENTH INTERNATIONAL ORNITHOLOGICAL CONGRESS OF A STANDING COMMITTEE ON ORNITHOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Letter dated 20th October, 1951, from Colonel R. Meinertzhagen, Chairman of the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature of the International Ornithological Congress

(Z.N.(G.)25)

I write to inform you, as Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, of certain important decisions taken by the International Ornithological Congress at its meeting held at Uppsala in June, 1950, with the object of promoting stability in ornithological nomenclature.

I have to explain that, after a general discussion at one of the plenary sessions, at which the view was strongly expressed that there was an urgent need for devising effective means for bringing before the International Commission the collective wishes of the ornithologists represented at the Congress, it was decided that a further meeting, open to all members of the Congress, should be held for the purpose of drawing up, on behalf of the Congress, a definite plan for communication to the International Commission. This further meeting, which was attended by a large number of members of the Congress and was thoroughly representative in character, decided that there should be established forthwith, as a Permanent Committee of the Congress, a Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature, charged with the duty of acting as the representative of the Congress in submitting proposals relating to ornithological nomenclature to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

The duties entrusted to the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature are :—

> To consider, on behalf of the International Ornithological Congress, problems arising in ornithological nomenclature, to formulate proposals in regard thereto designed to promote stability and uniformity in nomenclatorial practice, and, in the name of the International Congress, to transmit proposals, so formulated, to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for favourable consideration.

The Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature, of which I was appointed to act as the Chairman and intermediary between the Committee and the International Commission, is composed as follows :—

1. Colonel R. Meinertzhagen (Great Britain) (*Chairman*).
2. Professor E. Stresemann, Zoological Museum, Berlin (Germany).
3. Dr. J. Berlioz, National Museum of Natural History, Paris (France).
4. Dr. J. T. Zimmer, American Museum of Natural History, New York (U.S.A.).

A number of important and urgent problems are already under consideration by the Standing Committee, which hopes to be in a position to submit a preliminary group of proposals to the International Commission at a very early date. I am to express the hope of the Standing Committee and of the Congress generally that the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature will find it possible to deal promptly with applications submitted to it by the Standing Committee, for the value of the decisions taken will largely depend upon the speed with which they can be obtained.

PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO PUT AN END TO THE CONFUSION ARISING FROM THE DISCORDANT USE OF THE GENERIC NAME " COLYMBUS " LINNAEUS, 1758 (CLASS AVES)

Application submitted by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature of the International Ornithological Congress

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)78)

Covering letter, with enclosure, dated 19th October 1950, from Colonel R. Meinertzhagen, Chairman of the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature of the International Ornithological Congress.

As Chairman of the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature, I beg to forward to you the following recommendation relating to the generic name *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758, for favour of decision by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

For many years the name *Colymbus* Linnaeus has given rise to great confusion in ornithological nomenclature, for, owing to the lack of an authoritative ruling as to the type species of this genus, the generic name *Colymbus*, the family name COLYMBIDAE, and the ordinal name Colymbiformes have been used by one school of ornithologists for the Divers (Loons) and by another for the Grebes.

From a preliminary discussion which took place first at one of the Plenary Sessions of the Ninth International Ornithological Congress at Uppsala in July 1950 and later at a special meeting, open to all members of the Congress, held at the suggestion of the Congress at one of its Plenary Sessions, it was apparent that there was an overwhelming desire, on the part of the ornithologists present, to secure a final settlement of the long-standing *Colymbus* controversy.

The *Colymbus* problem was therefore among the first to which consideration was given by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature. The recommendations now submitted represent, in the unanimous opinion of the Standing Committee, the best solution that is now obtainable and the one calculated to secure the widest possible measure of support from ornithologists of all schools of thought.

ENCLOSURE

Proposals in regard to the generic name "Colymbus" Linnaeus, 1758, submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

The Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature of the International Ornithological Congress recommend the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature :—

(1) to use its plenary powers :—

(*a*) to suppress the generic name *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758 (*Syst. Nat.* (ed.10) **1** : 135) for the purposes of Article 25 (Law of Priority) but not for those of Article 34 (Law of Homonymy) ;

(*b*) to set aside all type selections hitherto made for the under-mentioned genera and to designate, as their respective type species, the species specified below :—

Name of Species	*Species designated as type species*
Gavia Forster, 1788, *Enchiridion Hist. nat.* 38	*Colymbus immer* Brünnich, 1764, *Orn. boreal.* 38
Podiceps Latham, 1787, *Gen. Synopsis Birds*, Suppl. **1** : 294	*Colymbus cristatus* Linnaeus 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 135

(2) to place on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* the generic names *Gavia* Forster, 1788, and *Podiceps* Latham, 1787, with, as their respective type species, the species so designated in (1) above ;

(3) to place the under-mentioned trivial names on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* ;—

(*a*) *cristatus* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Colymbus cristatus*)

(*b*) *immer* Brünnich, 1764 (as published in the binominal combination *Colymbus immer*) ;

(4) to place the generic name *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758, on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology.*

R. MEINERTZHAGEN, *Chairman of the Standing Committee.*

J. BERLIOZ, *Museum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris.*

E. STRESEMANN, *Zoologisches Museum der Universität, Berlin.*

JOHN T. ZIMMER, *The American Museum of Natural History, New York.*

REPORT ON THE PROBLEMS RAISED BY THE GENERIC NAME "COLYMBUS" LINNAEUS, 1758 (CLASS AVES)

By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)78)

At its Session held in Paris in 1948 the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature had under consideration the problems raised by the generic name *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758 (*Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 135) (Class Aves). Differences of opinion among ornithologists as to whether *Colymbus arcticus* Linnaeus, 1758, a Diver (Loon) or *Colymbus cristatus* Linnaeus, 1758, a Grebe, was, or should be accepted as being, the type species of the genus has divided ornithologists for three full generations and has led to the most serious confusion and lack of uniformity not only at the genus-name level but also at the family-name and Ordinal-name levels. By the time of the Paris Session, the International Commission itself had had this matter under consideration for twenty-two years, an application on this subject having been submitted to it by the late Dr. (subsequently Commissioner) Witmer Stone (*Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, U.S.A.*) as far back as 1926. No progress of any kind had however been made towards securing a settlement of this question.

2. At Paris the Commission came to the conclusion that the views held on this subject by the two opposing groups of ornithologists were so strongly held and the practice of each so deeply entrenched that there seemed little prospect of realising the hope that it had long entertained that ornithologists generally or at least a representative group of ornithologists would come forward with agreed proposals designed to restore uniformity and stability in this branch of ornithological nomenclature. The Commission concluded, therefore, that its proper course was to reach with as little further delay as possible a decision on the issue submitted to it by Dr. Witmer Stone in 1926. The Commission decided, as a first step, to obtain a report on the nomenclatorial issues involved from " a zoologist who was an authority on nomenclature but was not himself an ornithologist and who therefore had not had to prejudge the question in the course of his own work." Having reached this decision, the International Commission invited me to undertake this task in a personal capacity and I agreed to do so (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 361-362). The procedure so agreed upon was reported to, and approved by, the Section on Nomenclature of the Congress and by the Congress itself in Plenary Session.

3. In view of the importance of making progress with this case as rapidly as possible, I began the investigation entrusted to me not long after the close of the Paris meeting. When I came to examine in detail the arguments that had been advanced at different times by various ornithologists, I realised that I could not complete my Report until the *Official Record of the Proceedings* in Paris had been agreed upon in the prescribed manner, for it was evident that, in order to put into their proper perspective some of the arguments which had been advanced in regard to the present case, it would be necessary to quote from the *Official Record* passages containing decisions taken in Paris in regard to aspects of the *Règles*, the meaning of which had previously been open to doubt and which had a material bearing on the question referred to me for report.

4. The *Official Record of the Proceedings* in Paris was approved in January 1950, and I should thereupon have completed my Report and submitted it to the International Commission had it not been for the fact that I then received a letter from Commissioner Henning Lemche (*Universitetets Zoologiske Museum, Copenhagen*) informing me that his attention had been drawn by the Danish ornithologist Dr. Finn Salomonsen to certain proposals for an agreed settlement of the *Colymbus* problem which had been put forward by Dr. Erwin Stresemann (*Berlin*) at the International Ornithological Congress held at Oxford in 1934 ; no definite action in this matter had transpired either then or subsequently, but an International Ornithological Congress, the first since the war, was due to be held in Sweden at Uppsala later that year (1950), and it was possible that this question might be brought before that Congress. I regarded this suggestion as extremely valuable and one calculated to provide a solution of the *Colymbus* problem along the lines long desired by the Commission but so far never secured, namely through the presentation to the Commission by ornithologists themselves of a proposal for the solution of this problem. Later, I learnt, through Commissioner Lemche, that Dr. Salomonsen had himself decided to bring this matter before the Uppsala Congress, and he kindly furnished me with a copy of the communication which he proposed to make to that Congress on this subject.

5. Dr. Salomonsen's decision to lay this matter before the Ornithological Congress created an entirely new situation, for, if that Congress were to agree upon proposals for submission to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, the narrow issue on which in 1948 I had been invited to make a report might become of academic interest only. I accordingly decided to complete that Report but to withhold its submission to the Commission until after the meeting of the International Ornithological Congress at Uppsala later that year.

6. Shortly after the close of the Uppsala Congress I was informed by Colonel Richard Meinertzhagen that Dr. Salomonsen had duly presented his paper, that there had been a considerable discussion of a preliminary nature in regard to this and other individual cases of ornithological nomenclature at a public meeting specially convened for the purpose, that no decisions had been taken in regard to the name *Colymbus*, but that it had been decided to establish a Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature under his Chairmanship, that that Committee would as soon as possible take into detailed consideration the proposal in regard to the name *Colymbus* submitted to the Uppsala Congress by Dr. Salomonsen and that he hoped to be able to submit the recommendations of the Standing Committee on this case to the International Commission at an early date. On 19th October 1950 Colonel Meinertzhagen informed me by letter that the Standing Committee was unanimously agreed in asking the International Commission to use its plenary powers in such a way as to secure that, through the suppression of the name *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758, the oldest available generic names for the Grebes and the Divers should be *Podiceps* Latham, 1787, and *Gavia* Forster, 1788, respectively.

7. When the application from the Standing Committee was submitted to the customary routine examination, I found references to a generic name *Gavia* which, if an available name, would have had priority over the name *Gavia* Forster, 1788, the name recommended by the Standing Committee for stabilisation as the generic name for the Divers. The name in question was *Gavia* Nozemann & Vosmaer, 1758 (*in* Moehring, *Geslach. Vogel.* : 5, 54), a name more commonly (though incorrectly) known as *Gavia* Moehring. Prior to the Session of the International Commission held in Paris in 1948, there was some doubt as to whether or not new names published in the Dutch edition of Moehring's *Avium Genera* prepared by Nozemann & Vosmaer and published in 1758 under the title *Geslachten der Vogelen* were available names. In Paris, however, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature examined this question and decided that the names in this post-1757 edition of Moehring's pre-1758 work had not been reinforced by adoption or acceptance, as prescribed originally in *Opinion* 5 and, since the Paris Congress in the *Règles* themselves (1950 *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 150), and therefore that those names possessed no rights in zoological nomenclature (1950, *ibid.* **4** : 566-568). Thus, the alleged name *Gavia* Nozemann & Vosmaer, 1758, does not preoccupy the name *Gavia* Forster, 1788, for the Divers. In order to dispose of this matter once and for all, it will, however, be desirable that *Gavia* Nozemann & Vosmaer, 1758, should be placed on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* with (as in similar cases) a note as to why this name is invalid.

8. The routine investigation of this case disclosed also the existence of three generic names consisting of the word *Gavia*, each published subsequent to *Gavia* Forster, 1788. The names in question are : (1) *Gavia* Oken, 1816, *Lehrbuch Naturgesch.* **3** (Zool.) (2) : 537 ; (2) *Gavia* Boie, 1822, Oken's *Isis* **10** : 563 ; (3) *Gavia* Gloger, 1842, *Hand-und Hilfsbuch Naturgesch.* **1** : 433. In accordance with the direction given to the International Commission by the International Congress of Zoology that decisions on individual applications are in future to cover all aspects of the problems submitted, the foregoing names should be added to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* at the same time that the name *Gavia* Forster, 1788, is placed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, if the proposal to that end submitted by the Standing Committee on Ornithology is approved by the International Commission. At the same time there should also be added to the *Official Index* the two junior homonyms of *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758, namely : (1) *Colymbus* Paetel, 1875 (*Fam. Gatt. Moll.* : 50) ; (2) *Colymbus* Hadding, 1913 (*Univ. Arssk. Lund* (n.f.) **9**(2) (No. 15) : 79).

9. During his last visit to England, Dr. Ernst Mayr (*The American Museum of Natural History, New York*) drew my attention to the reference by Hartert (1915, *Die Vögel paläarkt. Fauna* (2) : 1456) to a generic name consisting of the word *Gavia* of older date than *Gavia* Forster, 1788, and suggested that this was a matter which should be investigated before the application relating to the *Colymbus* problem was considered by the International Commission. In the work referred to by Dr. Mayr, Hartert applied the name *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758, to the Divers, treating *Colymbus arcticus* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species. As in the case of other nominal genera recognised by him as representing taxonomically valid genera, Hartert cited under the name *Colymbus* Linnaeus, the names of nominal genera of later date which he regarded as junior synonyms. The first such entry reads as follows :—" *Gavia* Forster 1788—non S. G. Gmelin 1770 ! " It is unfortunate that Hartert did not cite a bibliographical reference for the name *Gavia* Gmelin, 1770, for this name is not noted either by Sherborn in his *Index Animalium* or by Neave in *Nomenclator Zoologicus*, and it has proved a matter of some difficulty to trace the original reference to it. This reference has however kindly been supplied by Dr. Mayr (*in litt.*, 8th August 1952). It is as follows : *Gavia* Gmelin (S.G.), 1770, *Reise durch Russland zur Untersuchung der drey Natur-Reiche* **1** : 152. This name was there used by Gmelin for a gull. (In furnishing this information, Dr. Mayr drew attention to the fact that, although the name *Gavia* is not now used for any genus of gull, it was frequently so used in the XIXth Century and that this word or its stem appears in a number of compound words which have been published for genera of gulls, e.g. *Gavina* Bonaparte, 1854 ; *Bruchigavia* Bonaparte, 1855 ; *Gabianus* Bruch, 1853.)

10. At the same time that Dr. Mayr furnished the foregoing information, he drew attention also to the fact that the first use in the literature of the word *Gavia* as a generic name was by Brisson in 1760 (*Ornithologie* **6** : 196). Brisson clearly did not apply the principles of binominal nomenclature in his *Ornithologie*—he was what in past times was called a " binary author "—but that work is of importance in ornithology and it is for this reason that in its *Opinion* 37 (1911, *Smithson Publ.* **2013** : 87-88) the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature ruled in favour of the acceptance, as available, of new generic names published in the *Ornithologie* and this ruling was validated and confirmed in 1948 (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 65). It is evident therefore that the name *Gavia* Brisson, 1760, will need to be disposed of, if the recommendation by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature is to be accepted. The fact that, as is now established, the word *Gavia* was used as a generic name at least twice (Brisson, 1760 ; Gmelin (S.G.), 1770) before it was so used by Forster in 1788 suggests the possibility that more intensive bibliographical investigations might bring to light some other use of *Gavia* as a generic name prior to Forster, 1788. In these circumstances, the only means by which an unchallengeable title could be provided for *Gavia* Forster, 1788, would be for the International Commission, when accepting that name for the divers, to adopt a procedure similar to that employed when in similar circumstances it was desired to give an impregnable position to the generic name *Spatangus* Gray, 1825 (Class Echinoidea) (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 526), that is, that the International Commission should use its plenary powers for the purpose of suppressing for the purposes both of the Law of Priority and of the Law of Homonymy all uses of the word *Gavia* as a generic name prior to *Gavia* Forster, 1788. At the same time it would be necessary to add to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* the two names (consisting of the word *Gavia* (i.e. *Gavia* Brisson, 1760 ; *Gavia* Gmelin (S.G.), 1770) which are known to have been published before *Gavia* Forster, 1788.

11. Finally, it is necessary to note that under a decision taken by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology at Paris in 1948 it is necessary, when any name is placed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, to note against that name the gender of the word of which that name is composed (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 341). Such entries will therefore be needed, if, as proposed by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature, the names *Podiceps* Lathem, 1787, and *Gavia* Forster, 1788, are now to be added to the *Official List*. The gender of the first of these names is masculine, that of the second, feminine.

12. I have consulted Colonel Meinertzhagen on the problem raised by the discovery of the generic names *Gavia* Brisson, 1760, *Gavia* Gmelin, 1770, and on the minor matters raised in paragraphs 7 and 8 of this Report, having communicated to him for this purpose a copy of this Report in draft. In reply, Colonel Meinertzhagen has since informed me that he is in full agreement with the action suggested in paragraphs 7, 8, 10, and 11 above which, as Chairman of the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature, he considers necessary and desirable for the purpose of giving effect to the proposal submitted to the International Commission by the Standing Committee under cover of his letter of 19th October 1950. In agreement with Colonel Meinertzhagen I have therefore prepared the revised form of request annexed to the present Report as Appendix 1. This form of request Colonel Meinertzhagen asks should be treated as constituting a textual revision of the application already submitted by the Standing Committee of which he is the Chairman. The Report on the narrow issue of the present position of *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758, under the *Règles*, which, as explained in paragraph 2 of the present Report, was prepared in response to the request addressed to me in 1948, is submitted as Appendix 2. It is submitted only for information, having been superseded, as the basis of possible action by the International Commission, by the proposal received later from the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature appointed by the International Ornithological Congress.

(signed) FRANCIS HEMMING.

28 Park Village East,
Regent's Park, London, N.W.1.
16*th August* 1952.

APPENDIX 1

APPLICATION REGARDING THE NAME "COLYMBUS" LINNAEUS, 1758, SUBMITTED TO THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE BY THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON ORNITHOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE, AS REVISED IN CERTAIN MINOR RESPECTS IN AGREEMENT WITH THE CHAIRMAN OF THE STANDING COMMITTEE

The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is asked :—

(1) to use its plenary powers :—

(*a*) to suppress the generic name *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy ;

(*b*) to suppress for the purposes both of the Law of Priority and of the Law of Homonymy any uses of the generic name *Gavia* prior to *Gavia* Forster, 1788 ;

(*c*) to set aside all type selections hitherto made for the under-mentioned nominal genera and to designate, as their respective type species the nominal species specified below :—

Name of genus (1)	*Species proposed to be designated as type species of genus specified in Col.* (1) (2)
Gavia Forster, 1788, *Enchiridion Hist. nat.* 38 (gender of generic name : feminine)	*Colymbus immer*, Brünnich, 1764, *Orn. boreal.* : 38
Podiceps Latham, 1787, *Suppl. gen. Synopsis Birds* [**1**] : 294 (gender of generic name : masculine)	*Colymbus cristatus* Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 135

(2) to place on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* the generic names *Gavia* Forster, 1788, and *Podiceps* Latham, 1787, with, as their respective type species, the species designated, as proposed in (1)(*c*) above ;

(3) to place the under-mentioned trivial names on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* :—

(*a*) *cristatus* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Colymbus cristatus*) (trivial name of type species of *Podiceps* Latham, 1787) ;

  - (*b*) *immer* Brünnich, 1764 (as published in the binominal combination *Colymbus immer*) (trivial name of type species of *Gavia* Forster, 1788):

(4) to place the under-mentioned generic names on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology*:—

  - (*a*) *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758 (*Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 135), as proposed in (1)(*a*) above to be suppressed under the plenary powers);
  - (*b*) *Colymbus* Paetel, 1875, *Fam. Gatt. Moll.* : 50) (junior homonym of *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758);
  - (*c*) *Colymbus* Hadding, 1913 (*Univ. Arssk. Lund* (n.f.) **9**(2) (No. 15) : 79) (junior homonym of *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758);
  - (*d*) *Gavia* Brisson, 1760 (*Ornithologie* **6** : 196) (as proposed, under (1)(*b*) above, to be suppressed under the plenary powers);
  - (*e*) *Gavia* Gmelin (S. G.), 1770 (*Reise Russl.* **1** : 152) (as proposed, under (1)(*b*) above, to be suppressed under the plenary powers);
  - (*f*) *Gavia*, all other uses as a generic name prior to *Gavia* Forster, 1788 (as proposed under (1)(*b*) above to be suppressed under the plenary powers);
  - (*g*) *Gavia* Oken, 1816 (*Lehrbuch Naturgesch.* **3** (Zool.) (2) : 537) (a junior homonym of *Gavia* Forster, 1788);
  - (*h*) *Gavia* Boie, 1822 (Oken's *Isis* **10** : 563) (a junior honomym of *Gavia* Forster, 1788);
  - (*i*) *Gavia* Gloger, 1842 (*Hand-und Hilfsbuch Naturgesch.* **1** : 433) (a junior homonym of *Gavia* Forster, 1788).

APPENDIX 2

REPORT ON THE TYPE SPECIES OF THE NOMINAL GENUS " COLYMBUS " LINNAEUS, 1758, PREPARED BY MR. FRANCIS HEMMING IN RESPONSE TO AN INVITATION BY THE THIRTEENTH INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ZOOLOGY, PARIS, 1948

To :—

The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

28 Park Village East,
Regent's Park,
London, N.W.1.

9*th February* 1950.

In compliance with the request addressed to me as " a zoologist who was an authority on nomenclature but was not himself an ornithologist and who therefore had not had to prejudge the question in the course of his own work " by the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 1948 (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **5** : 153) on the recommendation of the International Commission (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 361-362), a request later confirmed, with other recommendations submitted by the Section on Nomenclature and by the International Commission, by the International Congress in Plenary Session (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **5** : 131), I have the honour to submit the following Report on " the question of the nominal species which, under the *Règles*, is the type species of the genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Aves)."

2. When the foregoing invitation was extended to me, the urgency of the problem remitted to me for examination was strongly stressed by the International Commission. I accordingly began this investigation as soon as possible after the close of the Paris Congress. In consequence, the first draft of the present Report was completed some time ago. It has not however been possible for me until now to complete and sign this Report, for it was necessary to wait until the *Official Record of Proceedings* at Paris both of the International Commission and of the Section on Nomenclature of the Congress had been approved in the prescribed manner, since it was essential in the present Report at certain points to be able to quote from the *Official Record* passages containing decisions which had a direct bearing upon the problem remitted to me for report. Now, however, that the *Official Record* in question has been finally approved and is in page proof and I am in consequence in a position to quote the passages in question, I have completed my Report which I now submit for consideration.

3. Arrangement of the present Report ; In the present Report I first examine Article 30 of the *Règles*, the Article which governs the fixing of type species of nominal genera. Having thus established under which of the Rules in Article 30 the type species of the nominal genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758, falls to be determined, I examine in turn the claims which at different times have been advanced on behalf of various authors for recognition as the author by whom the type species of this nominal genus was determined. I have not thought it either necessary or desirable to quote from the numerous papers which at different times have been published on this subject, in view especially of the fact that much of the argument adduced in the earlier of these papers is beside the point, those arguments being based upon the assumed existence of a "Law of Elimination," a method for determining the type species of genera which, as is well known, had a considerable vogue prior to the adoption in 1901 of the present *Règles*, in which, however, such a provision found no place (see paragraph 16 below).

I. QUESTION OF THE RULE IN ARTICLE 30 UNDER WHICH THE TYPE SPECIES OF THE NOMINAL GENUS "COLYMBUS" LINNAEUS, 1758, WAS DETERMINED

4. The nature of the provisions in Article 30 relating to the determination of the type species of nominal genera : Article 30, the Article in the *Règles* which governs the determination of the type species of nominal genera, contains a series of Rules for the foregoing purpose and prescribes that these Rules are to be applied successively. Thus, in order to make a start in determining the type species of any given nominal genus, it is necessary to examine the position of that nominal genus in relation to each Rule in turn, for it is not until it has been established that the type species of such a genus was not determined under any of the preceding Rules that the position of that genus in relation to any of the later Rules has any relevance whatever. Accordingly, in the present part of this Report, I examine the position of the nominal genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758, in relation to each successive Rule in Article 30 for the purpose of ascertaining which of those Rules is applicable to that generic name.

5. Rule (*a*) (type species by original designation) : Rule (*a*) provides that, where the original author of a generic name himself designates a nominal species as the type species of the nominal genus so named, that action is final. When in 1758 Linnaeus published the Tenth Edition of the *Systema Naturae*, he did not designate type species for any of the nominal genera which he then established, for at that time the need for nomenclatorial purposes of such a concept as that of a " type species " for a nominal genus had not been recognised. Accordingly, Linnaeus did not in 1758 himself designate a type species for the nominal genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus. Rule (*a*) in Article 30 has therefore no bearing on the present case.

6. Rule (*b*) (type species by indication through the use of the words "typicus" or "typus" as the trivial name of one of the included species) : None of the nominal species referred by Linnaeus to his genus *Colymbus* bore as its trivial name either the word "*typicus*" or the word "*typus*." Rule (*b*) has therefore no bearing on this case.

7. Rule (*c*) (type species by monotypy) : Linnaeus placed more than one nominal species in the genus *Colymbus*. This genus is therefore not monotypical, and Rule (*c*) has, in consequence, no relevance to this case.

8. Rule (*d*) (type species by absolute tautonymy) : None of the nominal species referred by Linnaeus to the genus bore as its trivial name the word "*colymbus*." In its simplest form Rule (*d*) therefore does not apply to the present case. Nor does this Rule so apply under either of the two extensions made by *Opinions* 16 and 18 respectively (for the current application of the former of which see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 154, and for the latter, *ibid.* **4** : 153). For none of the nominal species cited by Linnaeus as belonging to the genus *Colymbus* either (1) was then cited with a synonym consisting of a pre-1758 univerbal specific name consisting of the word "*Colymbus*" (*Opinion* 16) or (2) possesses a synonym having, as its trivial name, the word "*colymbus*" (*Opinion* 18).

9. Rule (*e*) **:** The application of the term "Rule" to this provision is a misnomer, for it does not provide a test for determining the type species to be applied after Rule (*d*) and before Rule (*f*). All that this provision does is to deny eligibility for consideration as candidates for the status of type species to three classes of nominal species, namely (*a*) nominal species not included in the nominal genus concerned at the time when its name was first published; (*b*) nominal species which were *species inquirendae* from the standpoint of the author of the generic name concerned; (*c*) nominal species which were only doubtfully referred to the genus concerned by the author of the name of that genus. None of the species referred by Linnaeus in 1758 to the genus *Colymbus* was a *species inquirenda* from his standpoint, nor was any of those species only doubtfully referred by him to that genus. Accordingly, neither the second nor the third of the provisions contained in the so-called Rule (*e*) has any bearing on the question of the type species of the genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758. The first of these provisions (that which excludes from eligibility as type species any species not placed in a given genus by the original author of the generic name concerned), especially as clarified by the International Congress of Zoology in 1948 (as to which see paragraph 22 below), does, as will be seen in later parts of this Report, have an important bearing upon the validity of the arguments that have been advanced by some of those who have taken part in the discussion regarding the species to be accepted as the type species of *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758.

10. Rule (*f*) **(type species (i) of a nominal genus established to provide a name for an older nominal genus possessing an invalid name and (ii) of a nominal genus the name of which has been replaced for the foregoing reason) :** The generic name *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758, was not published as a substitute for the name of an older nominal genus, nor has this name ever been replaced on the ground that it was invalid. Thus, Rule (*f*) has no bearing upon the present case.

11. Rule (*g*) **(type species by subsequent selection) :** Having now examined in turn each of the Rules in Article 30 lettered (*a*) to (*f*) (both inclusive) and found that none of them is applicable to the name *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758, we are left only with Rule (*g*), the last of the mandatory provisions in the foregoing Article. We see therefore that, in order to ascertain what is the type species of the nominal genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758, it is necessary to ascertain by reference to the literature which of the species included in this genus by Linnaeus in 1758 was first selected to be the type species in a manner which satisfies the requirements of Article 30 of the *Règles*.

II. EXAMINATION OF THE CLAIMS ADVANCED ON BEHALF OF CERTAIN AUTHORS FOR RECOGNITION AS HAVING, AT SPECIFIED DATES, BEEN THE FIRST AUTHOR VALIDLY TO SELECT A TYPE SPECIES FOR THE NOMINAL GENUS "COLYMBUS" LINNAEUS, 1758

12. In the present Section I examine first the conditions which under Rule (*g*) in Article 30 must be satisfied in order to qualify the action of any given author to rank as constituting a valid selection of a type species for a nominal genus, the type species of which has not been determined under any of the earlier Rules in the foregoing Article. In the light of the survey so made, I then examine, in turn, the claims which have at different times been advanced for the recognition of particular authors as having, on specified dates, been the first author validly to select a type species for the nominal genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758.

(a) Provisions relating to the selection by an author of a type species for a given nominal genus prescribed in Rule (*g*) in Article 30 of the "Règles" and associated provisions

13. In order both to shorten and to simplify the later consideration of the claims which have been advanced in favour of the recognition of particular authors as having at specified dates been the first author validly to select a type species for the nominal genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758, I examine in the following paragraphs the conditions which must be satisfied in order to qualify the action of any given author for recognition as constituting a valid type selection under the *Règles*. This review appears to me essential, not only because in some of the arguments which have been advanced in regard to the type species of the genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758, those provisions have been misunderstood or even disregarded, but also because prior to 1948 some of the provisions concerned contained serious ambiguities which have now been removed as the result of decisions taken by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology at its meeting held in Paris in that year. The provisions of which it is necessary to take note are seven in number. Of these provisions the first consists of a qualification directly inserted into Rule (*g*) in Article 30 at the time (Boston, 1907) when that Article in its present form was inserted in the *Règles* : the second and third follow from interpretations of Rule (*g*) given by the Commission in *Opinions* rendered by the International Commission prior to 1939, each of which either in its original, or in some clarified, form was incorporated into the *Règles* by the International Congress of Zoology in 1948 ; the fourth, fifth, sixth and seventh of these provisions all relate to matters on which prior to 1948 the meaning of the *Règles* was in doubt and on which authoritative clarifications were in that year provided by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology.

(i) Provisions relating to the selection of the type species of a nominal genus contained in Rule (*g*) in Article 30 in the form in which that Article existed prior to July 1948

14. The expression "select the type species" : Rule (*g*) in Article 30, as that Article stood prior to July 1948, provided that, where the type species of a given nominal genus had not been determined under any of the preceding Rules in that Article, its type species should be the first of the originally included species to be so selected by a subsequent author. This provision was accompanied by the following interpretation of the meaning to be attached to the expression " select the type " (an expression amended to " select the type species " by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology—see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 300) : " The meaning of the expression ' select the type ' is to be rigidly construed. Mention of a species as an illustration or example does not constitute a selection of a type."

(ii) Provisions relating to the selection of the type species of a nominal genus originally promulgated in " Opinions " rendered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and in 1948 incorporated into the " Règles " either in their original or in a modified form

15. The *Opinions* relating to the interpretation of Rule (*g*) in Article 30 rendered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature prior to the meeting held in Paris in 1948 which have a bearing upon the present case are *Opinions* 6 and 62. The rulings given in these *Opinions* are discussed in the two immediately following paragraphs.

16. The so-called " Law of Elimination " not recognised in the " Règles " as a mandatory provision : Prior to the international regulation of zoological nomenclature (through the adoption of the present *Règles* by the Fifth International Congress of Zoology at Berlin in 1901) zoologists possessed no authoritative guide as to how they should proceed when they desired to split up a previously established genus, save in those cases where the original author of the generic name concerned had himself specified a type species for the genus so named. For, although the concept of a " type species " in relation to genera was generally accepted, there was no agreement how to apply that concept in relation to nominal genera established without designated type species, for example, nominal genera, other than monotypical genera, established by Linnaeus and other authors of later date. Authors were forced therefore to make a choice for themselves as to how they should proceed in this matter. The result, as was inevitable, was that there was the greatest diversity of practice : some authors applied rules similar to those later embodied in the present Rule (*g*) in Article 30, under which the species first selected to be the type species of a given species was accepted as such ; others accepted as the type species the first of any series of species placed in a given nominal genus by its author (the so-called " chef de file " system) ; others adopted a system under which it was assumed that, whenever an author on taxonomic grounds removed a species from a given previously established nominal genus by placing it in some other nominal genus, the species so removed ceased to be eligible to become the type species of the genus from which it had been removed ; in this way, it was argued, the field from which a type species could be selected was gradually narrowed until finally either only one of the original species was left in the genus and that species automatically became the type species or until some author selected as the type species of the genus one of the originally included species which had not yet been removed from that genus on taxonomic grounds. This method of determining the type species of a genus was known as the "Law of Elimination." Theoretically, this system possessed advantages over any other system, for, if it could have been applied in a uniform manner, it would have avoided the confusing transfers of generic names from one genus to another which have often resulted from the acceptance as the type species of a genus of the first originally included species to be so selected. Unfortunately, however, insuperable difficulties were often encountered in applying this superficially simple rule owing to differences of opinion among specialists as to what action did or did not constitute the removal of a species from a given genus. The result was that, far from providing the stability which had been hoped for, this so-called "Law" often resulted in the adoption by specialists of totally different views as to the type species of any given genus. This method of determining the type species of a genus had the further weakness that its application was extemely laborious involving the examination of the entire literature of any group before a type-determination could even be attempted and thus placed a premium upon bibliographical investigations as contrasted with zoological investigations. It was for these reasons that, when the present *Règles* were adopted, the "Law of Elimination" was given no place in the mandatory provisions embodied in Article 30. The only concession then granted to this former unofficial "Law" was the insertion in the non-mandatory "Recommendations" at the end of Article 30 of the advice to specialists when selecting the type species of a genus to bear in mind the importance of promoting stability by not selecting as the type species of genera species which on taxonomic grounds are currently treated as having been removed therefrom. Even this "Recommendation" occupies only the fourth place in the list of "Recommendations" there given. Normally, practices in vogue before the adoption of the *Règles* which however failed to secure admittance to the *Règles* are of historical interest only, but in the particular case of the nominal genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus the application of the so-called "Law of Elimination" bulked so largely in the early days—and, indeed, still forms the basis of the argument advanced by one large and important group of workers—that it seems essential in the present Report to make it perfectly clear that in its original form the "Law of Elimination" finds no place in the *Règles*. It should be noted at this point that in one extremely limited application official approval has been given to the principle of "elimination" in a mandatory provision enacted since the adoption of the *Règles* in 1901. This was in 1910, the year in which the Commission's *Opinion* 6 was published (*Smithson. Publ.* **1938** : 6), for in that *Opinion* the Commission ruled that, where a nominal genus was established with two nominal species but without a designated type species and later one of those nominal species was made the type species of a newly established monotypical genus, it was to be deemed for nomenclatorial purposes to have been removed by elimination from the earlier genus, which was thus left with only one species which accordingly became the type species. In the years following the publication of this *Opinion* it was sometimes argued that the ruling there given need not be regarded as being confined to cases where a species was removed from a genus to a monotypical genus and further that the principle embodied in this *Opinion* was properly applicable also to cases where more than two species were placed in a genus and later authors removed some of those species, either singly or in groups. This latter argument, if well founded, would have amounted to a full-scale recognition of the Law of Elimination and would greatly have reduced the scope within which Rule (*g*) in Article 30 would operate and in some cases would have completely superceded that Rule. This matter was considered by the Commission and the Congress at Paris in 1948, and it was then decided to incorporate in the *Règles* the decision originally given in *Opinion* 6, clarified, however, in such a way as to make it absolutely clear that it applied only to the limited class of case originally specified in that *Opinion* (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 157).

17. A nominal species which is the type species of one genus eligible for selection as the type species of another genus: In the preceding paragraph we have considered the position of the so-called " Law of Elimination " in relation to the provisions of the *Règles* as adopted at Berlin in 1901, and have specially noted the one instance in which, through *Opinion* 6, mandatory force was given to the principle embodied in that so-called " Law ," which, as explained, had in its main form been rejected by the authors of the present *Règles*. We have here to note a decision taken by the Commission in *Opinion* 62 (published in 1914) (*Smithson. Publ.* **2256** : 147-149) rejecting an attempt to secure a further partial acceptance of the principle of elimination. Up to that time it had sometimes been argued that, where a nominal genus had been established with a number of included nominal species but without a designated type species, the species which were eligible for selection by a later author acting under Rule (*g*) in Article 30 were not all the originally included nominal species but only those species which had not in the meantime become the type species of other genera. This argument, which, it will be observed, relates to one of the situations which (as explained in paragraph 16) some authors had sought to argue could be brought within the scope of the decision taken in *Opinion* 6, was rejected by the Commission which ruled that a species which was the type species of one genus was still eligible for selection as the type species of another genus. This decision was endorsed both by the Commission and the Congress in 1948 and was embodied by the latter in the *Règles* (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 156).

(iii) Provisions relating to the selection of the type species of a nominal genus adopted by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 1948

18. At Paris in 1948 the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature obtained the approval of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology for the insertion in the *Règles* of provisions clarifying the meaning of Rule (*g*) in Article 30 in four respects. Each of these clarifications has, as will be seen, a bearing on the question of the species to be accepted as the type species of the nominal genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758. These clarifications are accordingly described briefly in the following paragraphs.

19. Meaning to be attached to the word " select " as used in the expression " select a type species " as used in Rule (*g*) in Article 30 : Reference has already been made (paragraph 14 above) to the supplementary provision in Rule (*g*) in Article 30 which makes it clear that that Rule is not satisfied if an author merely cites one of the species originally included in a nominal genus established by some earlier author as being an " illustration " or " example " of that genus and prescribes that the expression " select a type " is to be " rigidly construed." This provision removed what otherwise would have been a serious ambiguity in that Rule, but it left obscure another matter which, as every worker in systematic zoology has occasion to know, constantly arose, whenever it was necessary to determine whether a type species had been validly selected for a given nominal genus. The problem involved was whether an author was to be deemed to have selected the type species of a given nominal genus when, while stating categorically that a given species was the type species, he made it clear also that he regarded himself, not as selecting that species to be the type species, but as doing no more than place on record that that species was the type species as the result of action taken by an earlier author or by earlier authors. The most frequent situation of this kind arises in the case of papers published before the adoption of the *Règles* where an author guiding himself by the so-called " Law of Elimination " (see paragraph 16 above) came to the conclusion that, as the result of the removal of species to other genera, only one species remained eligible for the position of type species of the genus under examination and therefore that species had automatically become the type species " by elimination." The same problem arises also where an author states that a given species is the type species of a genus because it had been so selected by a previous author, when on further examination it is found that no such earlier selection had been made. In view of the very large number of currently accepted type selections which rest upon statements made in papers published before 1901 by authors working under the " Law of Elimination," it was obvious that any ruling which deprived statements of the kind described above of the status of type selections would cause the utmost havoc and confusion. It was obvious also, however, that a definite ruling on this subject was required in order to make it impossible validly to question the acceptability of such type selections. Accordingly, in Paris in 1948 the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, on the recommendation of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, agreed to insert in the *Règles* words making it clear that, " for the purposes of Rule (*g*) in Article 30, an author is to be treated as having selected a given originally included nominal species to be the type species of a given nominal genus not only when he . . . states that he is so selecting that species but also when he does no more than state that a specified such species is the type species of the nominal genus concerned, irrespective, in the latter case, of whether he states or implies, either correctly or otherwise, that that nominal species had been selected by some previous author to be the type species of that nominal genus, or that the nominal species had become the type species of that genus through the operation of some rule (for example, the so-called " Law of Elimination ") not recognised in the *Règles* as a mandatory provision, provided in such a case that the author concerned makes it clear that he himself accepts, for whatever reason, the species in question as the type species of the genus concerned " (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 181-182).

20. Action taken in regard to a given generic name prior to its first valid publication subsequent to 1757 irrelevant for the purposes of Article 30 : Prior to 1948 it occasionally happened that, notwithstanding the provision in Article 26 and the associated *Opinion* 3 (1910, *Smithson. Publ.* **1938** : 6) that for the purposes of the *Règles* zoological nomenclature has, as its starting point, the publication in 1758 of the Tenth Edition of the *Systema Naturae* of Linnaeus, an author would seek to support an argument in relation to some particular name by claiming that some action in regard to that name taken prior to 1758 had some bearing either upon the species to be regarded as the originally included species of the nominal genus so named or as regards the eligibility of such species for selection after 1757 as the type species of the genus in question. In order to dispose of fallacious arguments of this sort, the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 1948, on the advice of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, decided to insert in the *Règles* words to make it clear that "Article 30 relates only to the designation, indication, or selection of the type species of a nominal genus published subsequent to 31st December 1757, that is to say to the name of a genus originally published subsequent to the above date by a given author in a given work and that the action then taken by that author is alone relevant to the question, (1) of what species are to be regarded as having been originally included in the genus concerned . . . or (ii) of whether the type species of the genus in question is to be treated as having been designated . . . at the time of the original publication of the generic name concerned " (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 347-348).

21. A type selection related to any place of publication other than the original place of publication of a generic name invalid under the " Règles " : Another argument occasionally advanced before 1948 in relation to particular cases (of which the name *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758, was one) was that, where a given word had been used as a generic name prior to the starting point of zoological nomenclature (as defined in Article 26) as well as at or after that starting point and some later author purported to select a type species for the genus as published before 1758, that action should be regarded as constituting also a selection of a type species for the genus as established after the starting point of zoological nomenclature, i.e. after the close of the year 1757. This argument was considered and rejected in Paris, in 1948, when the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, on the advice of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, agreed to insert in the *Règles* words making it clear that " no selection of the type species of a given nominal genus, which is related to any publication of the name of that genus other than its first valid publication by its author . . . is to be accepted as a selection of the type species of that genus for the purposes of Rule (*g*) in Article 30 " (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 348).

22. Nominal species eligible for selection as the type species of any given nominal genus : We have now examined the decisions taken by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology for the purpose of clarifying the provisions regarding the method to be followed in selecting the type species of a nominal genus under Rule (*g*) in Article 30. But the obscurities which formerly marred that Rule and made its application uncertain and open to question in many cases were not the only difficulties which up to 1948 had confronted systematists in attempting either to determine what nominal species was the type species of a given nominal genus or what nominal species were eligible for selection as such. For, although Article 30 contained (in the provision misnamed " Rule (*c*) ") a provision excluding certain nominal species from consideration as possible type species for any given nominal genus, it unfortunately contained no positive provision specifying what nominal species were to be regarded as eligible for selection as type species. In particular, there was nothing in Article 30 to show whether the field of choice for an author selecting a type species was limited to those nominal species recognised as taxonomically valid by the original author of the generic name or whether in addition a nominal species cited by the original author of a generic name in the synonymy of any one of the nominal species placed by him in the genus as representing taxonomically valid species was also eligible for selection as the type genus. Moreover, there was no express provision in Article 30 on the question whether the selection as the type species of a genus of a nominal species not cited by the original author of a generic name should be accepted or rejected in those cases where later authors subjectively identified the nominal species so selected with one of the nominal species actually cited by the original author at the time when the generic name was first validly published. In 1948, however, these obscurities were removed when the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, on the advice of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, decided to insert in the *Règles* words making it clear that " the nominal species to be regarded as having been included in a given nominal genus when the name of that genus was first published are (i) the nominal species cited by the original author as valid taxonomic species belonging to that nominal genus and (ii) any nominal species cited on that occasion as synonyms of nominal species falling in (i) above and that for such a nominal genus the foregoing nominal species were alone eligible for selection as the type species " (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 179-180).

(b) The field within which alone a valid type-selection for " Colymbus " Linnaeus, 1758, can be made under the " Règles "

23. The content of the nominal genus " Colymbus " Linnaeus, 1758, for nomenclatorial purposes : The name *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758 (*Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 135) was published for a nominal genus to which at that time Linnaeus referred four nominal species, namely :—(1) *Colymbus arcticus* Linnaeus (: 135) ; (2) *Colymbus cristatus* Linnaeus (: 135) ; (3) *Colymbus auritus* Linnaeus (: 135) ; (4) *Colymbus podiceps* Linnaeus (: 136). Under the clarification of the meaning to be attached to the expression " originally included species " prescribed by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology in 1948 (see paragraph 22 above), the four nominal species bearing the foregoing specific trivial names are the only nominal species eligible to become the type species of the nominal genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758.

(c) The authors who, it has been claimed, either selected a type species for the nominal genus " Colymbus " Linnaeus, 1758, or took action having an equivalent effect

24. Latham, 1707: The first author who, it has been claimed, took action having the effect of determining the type species of the nominal genus *Colymbus*

Linnaeus, 1758, was Latham (1787, *Suppl. gen. Synopsis Birds* [**1**] : 294). The argument adduced runs as follows :—(1) The genus *Colymbus* as established by Linnaeus in 1758 was heterogeneous from the taxonomic standpoint, containing (*a*) one palmate-footed species (*pedibus palmatis*), the Northern Diver, *Colymbus arcticus*, and (*b*) three pinnate-footed species (*pedibus lobatis*), the Grebes *Colymbus cristatus*, *auritus* and *podiceps*. (2) Latham (1787) recognised the impropriety, from the systematic point of view, of including these disparate elements in a single genus and accordingly, as a first reviser, rectified the position (in the tabular statement at the end of his first supplementary volume) by erecting a new genus which he named *Podiceps* (: 294) and to which he assigned the three Grebes which Linnaeus had placed in *Colymbus* (i.e., *C. cristatus*, *auritus* and *podiceps*), together with other Grebes, and which he placed in his " Order VIII. With pinnated feet " ; at the same time Latham retained (: 295) the genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus, placing in it the only remaining species (*Colymbus arcticus*) that Linnaeus had placed in his genus *Colymbus*, together with other Divers. This genus Latham placed in his " Order IX Webfooted." (3) The removal by Latham from the genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus of the three Grebes placed in it by Linnaeus in 1758, by the transfer of those species to his new genus *Podiceps*, left, so it was argued, only one species in the genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus as constituted in 1758, namely the nominal species *Colymbus arcticus* Linnaeus, and in consequence that species, by virtue of Latham's action, automatically became the type species of *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758, under the " Law of Elimination." This argument, which was originally advanced before the introduction of the present *Règles*, is invalid, since those *Règles* do not recognise a " Law of Elimination " as a mandatory provision for the determination of the type species of genera (paragraphs 16 and 17 above).

25. Gray (G. R.), 1840 : In 1840 (*List Genera Birds* : 76) Gray (G. R.) selected *Colymbus glacialis* Linnaeus, 1766 (*Syst. Nat.* (ed. 12) **1**(1) : 221) as the type species of the genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus, to which name Gray did not attribute a date. This nominal species was not one of the four such species placed by Linnaeus in the genus *Colymbus* in 1758 (see paragraph 23 above)—and, indeed, could not have been so included, for its name was not published until eight years later. Thus, this nominal species is ineligible to become the type species of the nominal genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758, and Gray's action in so selecting it is therefore invalid.

26. Gray (G. R.), 1841 : In 1841 (*List Genera Birds* (ed. 2) : 96) Gray again treated *Colymbus glacialis* Linnaeus, 1766, as the type species of *Colymbus* Linnaeus, to which, as in the first edition he attributed no date. This type selection is invalid for the same reasons as is the same selection made by Gray in 1840 (see paragraph 25 above).

27. Gray (G. R.), 1842 : In 1842 (*Appendix List Genera Birds* : 15) Gray published a sixteen-page pamphlet in which he added supplementary notes in regard to certain of the generic names included in the second edition of his *List*. Many of these notes consisted in the attribution of dates to generic names previously published without information on this point. In the case of the name *Colymbus* Linnaeus, the entry in the Appendix of 1842 was :—" *Colymbus*, after *L.* add 1735." From the point of view of nomenclature, this entry would have been of great importance, if in other respects the type selection for the genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus made in the Second Edition of Gray's *List* had complied with the *Règles* (which, as we have seen—paragraph 26 above—it did not), for the insertion of the date " 1735 " after the name *Colymbus* L. shows that Gray was dealing not with the Tenth Edition of the *Systema Naturae* of 1758 (the starting point of zoological nomenclature) but with the use of that name by Linnaeus in 1735 in the First Edition of the *Systema Naturae*. Under the *Règles* action taken in respect of a name as published prior to 1758 is totally irrelevant from the point of view of determining the type species of a nominal genus established after the starting point of zoological nomenclature (i.e. a name published in, or after, 1758) (see paragraph 20 above) and the selection of a type species of a genus, if related to any place of publication other than the first place in which that name was validly published, is invalid, having no force under Article 30 (see paragraph 21 above).

28. Gray (G. R.), 1855 In 1855 there appeared what was, in effect, a third edition of the *List of Genera of Birds*, of which, as we have seen (paragraphs 25 and 26 above) the First and Second Editions were published respectively in 1840 and 1841 ; it was however published under a slightly different title and it accordingly ranks for bibliographical purposes as a separate work. In this latest work Gray (1) adhered to the dating of the name *Colymbus* Linnaeus adopted in his *Appendix* of 1842, that is, he attributed it to the First Edition of the *Systema Naturae* of 1735 and not to the Tenth Edition of 1758, and (2) made a fresh type selection for the genus *Colymbus* abandoning his earlier selection of *Colymbus glacialis* Linnaeus, 1766, adopting in its place *Colymbus arcticus* Linnaeus, 1758. If Gray's action on this occasion had otherwise been in conformity with the *Règles*, the selection of *C. arcticus* Linnaeus would have been valid, since that nominal species is one of those referred to the genus *Colymbus* by Linnaeus in 1758. But the fact that Gray attributed the name *Colymbus* to a place of publication other than the place where that name was first validly published after the starting point of zoological nomenclature (i.e. other than the Tenth Edition of the *Systema Naturae*) renders his action in 1855 invalid for the reasons explained in paragraphs 20 and 21 above.

29. Fitzinger, 1865 : In 1926 (*Ibis* (12)**4** : 819) Sclater advanced the view that in 1865 (*SitzBer. Akad. wiss. Wien* (Math-Naturw. Kl.) **51** : 320) Fitzinger had selected *Colymbus arcticus* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of the nominal genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus. As however was pointed out by Hellmayr & Conover in 1948 (*Field Mus. Publ. Chicago* (Zool.) **13** (Pt. 1) (No. 2) : 18, footnote), Fitzinger expressly stated in the preface to his paper that what he intended to do was to cite for each of the genera and subgenera concerned one of the typical species. The supplementary provision annexed to Rule (*g*) in Article 30 lays it down that the citation of a species as an example of a genus does not constitute the selection of that species as the type species of the genus concerned (see paragraph 14 above). Accordingly, Fitzinger's action in 1865 does not constitute a valid selection of *Colymbus arcticus* Linnaeus as the type species of *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758.

30. Baird, Brewer & Ridgway, 1884 : In 1884 (*Water Birds N. Amer.* **2** : 425) Baird, Brewer & Ridgway, when dealing with the genus *Colymbus*

Linnaeus, 1758, stated that *Colymbus cristatus* Linnaeus, 1758, was the " Type, by elimination." This species is, as we have seen (paragraph 23) one of these originally included by Linnaeus in the genus *Colymbus* in 1758, and, as in 1884 that genus was still without a validly determined type species, it was eligible for selection as such. The only argument which could at any time have been advanced against the acceptance of the action by Baird, Brewer & Ridgway as constituting a type-selection for the genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758, was that those authors did not look upon themselves as selecting *Colymbus cristatus* Linnaeus as the type species of this genus—indeed, they made it clear that they deplored the necessity of accepting it as such—but on the contrary considered that that species had already become the type species " by elimination." As explained in paragraph 19 above, consideration was given in 1948 both by the Commission and by the International Congress of Zoology to the question whether a definite statement that a given nominal species was the type species of a particular genus constituted a selection of that species as the type species when the author making the statement made it clear that he did not regard himself as so selecting the species in question, considering rather that for one reason or another that species had already become the type species as the result of action taken by earlier authors ; it was then decided that such a statement should be accepted as constituting a selection under Rule (*g*) in Article 30, provided that the author making the statement made it clear that he himself recognised the species in question as the type species of the genus concerned. Baird, Brewer & Ridgway made it perfectly clear that they regarded *Colymbus cristatus* Linnaeus as the type species of *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758, and accordingly the possible objection to the acceptance of their action is now seen to be without foundation.

31. Action by authors subsequent to Baird, Brewer & Ridgway, 1884 : Once a nominal genus has validly acquired a type species under the provisions of Article 30, no action by any later author can change the type species of that genus. In the present case, we have seen (paragraph 30 above) that in 1884 the nominal genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758, which up to that time was without a type species under the *Règles*, acquired a type species through the selection as such of *Colymbus cristatus* Linnaeus, 1758, by Baird, Brewer & Ridgway. I have therefore considered unnecessary in the present Report to recapitulate the later history of the generic name *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758. I have however examined later papers on this subject for the purpose of ascertaining whether any of them contain new evidence relevant to the present subject. I find that they do not. Those authors (e.g. Stejneger) who applied the name *Colymbus* Linnaeus to the Grebes have based themselves on the selection, as the type species of this genus, of *Colymbus cristatus* Linnaeus, 1758, by Baird, Brewer & Ridgway (1884) or upon the later similar selection by the A.O.U. in 1886 (*Check-List N.Amer. Birds* : 73), while those authors who have applied this name to the Divers (Loons) have either (as did Witmer Stone in 1926) accepted Gray's (1855) selection of *Colymbus arcticus* Linnaeus, 1758, or (as did Lonnberg in 1927) have argued in favour of the view that the same species should be accepted as the type species as the result of the action taken in 1787 by Latham, when establishing the nominal genus *Podiceps*.

III. PRINCIPAL CONCLUSIONS AND FINDING

32. Principal Conclusions : Having thus completed the survey of the problem involved in determining what species is, under the *Règles*, the type species of the genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758, which in Paris in 1948 I was invited to undertake, I now submit as follows the principal conclusions which I have reached :—

(1) The type species of the nominal genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758, was neither designated under Rule (*a*) in Article 30 nor indicated under any of the Rules lettered (*b*), (*c*), (*d*) or (*f*) in that Article (paragraphs 5-10).

(2) In view of (1) above, the type species of the foregoing nominal genus falls to be determined under Rule (*g*) in Article 30 (type species by subsequent selection) (paragraph 11).

(3) Latham (1787), when establishing the nominal genus *Podiceps* and transferring thereto the three Grebes referred to the genus *Colymbus* by Linnaeus in 1758, thus leaving in the genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758, only one of the species referred thereto by Linnaeus in 1758, namely the Diver, *Colymbus arcticus* Linnaeus, 1758, did not thereby make that species the type species of *Colymbus* Linnaeus. For Article 30 of the *Règles* does not recognise the so-called " Law of Elimination " and under the *Règles* it was legitimate for any later author to select any of the originally included species to be the type species of *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758, notwithstanding the action taken by Latham in 1787 (paragraph 24).

(4) The selection by Gray in 1840 and again in 1841 of *Colymbus glacialis* Linnaeus, 1766, as the type species of *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758, is invalid, because that nominal species was not one of the nominal species referred to the genus *Colymbus* by Linnaeus in 1758 and, indeed, could not have been so referred, as it was not named until eight years later (paragraphs 25 and 26).

(5) The selection by Gray in 1855 of *Colymbus arcticus* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of the genus *Colymbus* is invalid, since that selection related not to the nominal genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758, but to the pre-1758 nominal genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1735 (paragraph 28).

(6) Fitzinger (1865) cited *Colymbus arcticus* Linnaeus, 1758, as one of the typical species of the genus *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758, but he did not select that species to be the unique type species of that genus. Accordingly, under the provision in Rule (*g*) in Article 30 that the expression " select the type " is to be " rigidly construed," Fitzinger did not select a type species for *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758 (paragraph 29).

(7) Baird, Brewer & Ridgway in 1884 stated that *Colymbus cristatus* Linnaeus, 1758, was the type species of *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758. That nominal species is one of those originally included in the genus *Colymbus* by Linnaeus in 1758, and was therefore eligible for

selection as the type species of that genus. Under Rule (*g*) in Article 30, as clarified by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology in 1948, the validity of the action taken by the foregoing authors is not impaired by the fact that they regarded themselves not as selecting the above species to be the type species of *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758, but as merely recording (incorrectly) that it was already the type species " by elimination " (paragraph 30).

33. FINDING. In discharge of the duty entrusted to me in 1948, jointly by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology and the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, I have to report that, in the light of the conclusions summarised in the preceding paragraph, my Finding on the question referred to me is as follows :—

Under the " Règles " the type species of the nominal genus " Colymbus " Linnaeus, 1758, is the nominal species " Colymbus cristatus " Linnaeus, 1758, that nominal species being one of those included by Linnaeus in the nominal genus " Colymbus " in 1758 and being the first such species to be validly selected under Rule (*g*) in Article 30 to be the type species of this nominal genus, having been so selected by Baird, Brewer & Ridgway in 1884

(signed) FRANCIS HEMMING.

9th February 1950.

PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO SUPPRESS THE TRIVIAL NAME " CASPICUS " HABLIZL, 1783 (AS PUBLISHED IN THE BINOMINAL COMBINATION " COLYMBUS CASPICUS ") (CLASS AVES)

Application submitted by the
Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature of the
International Ornithological Congress

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)525)

Covering letter, with enclosure, dated 19th October, 1950, from Colonel R. Meinertzhagen, Chairman of the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature.

As Chairman of the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature, I beg to forward to you the annexed recommendation relating to the name *Colymbus caspicus* Hablizl, 1783, for favour of decision by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

The circumstances of the present case were described in a note published by Dr. E. Stresemann, a Member of the Standing Committee, in 1948 (Stresemann, 1948, *Ibis* **90** : 473-474), extracts from which are given in the Annexe to the application now submitted.

The specific action which the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is asked to take is that it should : (1) use its plenary powers to suppress the trivial name *caspicus* Hablizl, 1783 (as published in the combination *Colymbus caspicus*) for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy ; (2) place the trivial name *nigricollis* Brehm, 1831 (as published in the combination *Podiceps nigricollis*) on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology :* and (3) place the trivial name *caspicus* Hablizl, 1783 (as published in the combination *Colymbus caspicus*) as proposed, under (1) above, to be suppressed under the plenary powers, on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology*.

ENCLOSURE

The trivial name comprised in the specific name " Colymbus caspicus " Hablizl, 1783, " Neue nordische Beyträge " 4 : 9

It is recommended that the above name should be made a *nomen rejectum* and that the trivial name comprised in the name currently accepted for this species, namely *Podiceps nigricollis* Brehm (C.L.), 1831, *Handb. Naturg. Vög. Deutschl.* : 963 (" Deutschland "), be made a *nomen conservandum*.

The name *Podiceps nigricollis* has been used for the Black-necked Grebe from 1831 to 1948. The circumstances of the present case have been discussed by Stresemann in a note entitled " The earliest description of the Black-necked Grebe " published in 1948 (*Ibis* **90** : 473-474), from which extracts have been made for the information of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and are submitted in the Annexe to the present application.

R. MEINERTZHAGEN : *Chairman of the Standing Committee.*

E. STRESEMANN : *Zoologisches Museum der Universität, Berlin.*

JOHN T. ZIMMER : *The American Museum of Natural History, New York.*

ANNEXE TO APPLICATION

Extract from a paper entitled " The earliest description of the Black-necked Grebe " (1948, " Ibis," 90 : 473-474)

Changes in scientific nomenclature are becoming increasingly unpopular among ornithologists, and rightly so. It is especially awkward if a name of long standing and of very frequent use has to be discarded under present rules in favour of a quite unknown one. I see, however, no way for avoiding supersession of *Podiceps nigricollis* Brehm, 1831, by *Podiceps caspicus* (Hablizl, 1783).

In his article " Bemerkungen in der persischen Landschaft Gilan und auf den Gilanischen Gebirgen in den Jahren 1773 und 1774," published in vol. 4 (1783) of Pallas's magazine " Neue Nordische Beyträge," Carl Hablizl on page 9 gave the following detailed description of a grebe which he had met by the end of November 1773 in the Bay of Enzeli, Caspian Sea, and which he proposed to call *Colymbus caspicus* : " Magnitudo Columbae domesticae, Rostrum plumbeum pollicare, Caput et reiquum corpus supra fusco nigricat. Gula et genae, lateraque colli superioris alba ; collum inferius gryseum. Pectus, abdomen et venter albo-argentea. Alae complicatae ad uropygium protensae. Uropygium infimum albo-nigroque vatiegatum. Remiges a prima ad sectum immaculatae, fuscae, a sexta ad decimum candidae, uno latere fusco maculatae, a decima vero ad vigesimam primam usque immaculatae, candidae. Tectrices alarum fuscae. Pedes et digiti interius cinereo-virescentes, exterius fusco-nigricantes. Oculorum irides, ut et palpebrae, rubrae."

That this bird was undoubtedly a Black-necked, and not a Slavonian, Grebe (in the synonymy of which the name *Colymbus caspicus* had been sunk by all previous authors, Ogilvie-Grant and Hartert), is proved by the colour of the inner primaries, which are always entirely dark in *P. auritus*, not partially white (candidae, uno latere fusco-maculatae).

PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO SUPPRESS FOUR TRIVIAL NAMES FOR BIRDS PUBLISHED BY ANTON AUGUST HEINRICH LICHTENSTEIN IN 1793

Application submitted by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature of the International Ornithological Congress

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)526)

Covering letter, with enclosure, dated 19th October, 1950, from Colonel R. Meinertzhagen, Chairman of the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature of the International Ornithological Congress.

As Chairman of the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature, I beg to forward to you the annexed application relating to four trivial names for birds published by A. Lichenstein in 1793, for favour of decision by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

The Standing Committee is unanimous in its view as regards the first and second of the names dealt with in the present application. In the case of the third name (*Cuculus sulphuratus* Lichtenstein (A.), 1793), one member of the Standing Committee (Dr. John T. Zimmer) does not support the proposal submitted.

The problem dealt with in the present application has been discussed by Meise & Stresemann in a paper entitled " Notes on South African birds described in A. Lichtenstein's 'Catalogus,' 1793," published earlier this year in the *Ibis* (Meise & Stresemann, 1950, *Ibis* **92** : 22-26), extracts from which are quoted in the application now submitted.

I have to add that a slight amplification is necessary in the case of the third of the proposals now submitted to the International Commission by the Standing Committee. The object of that proposal is to provide a secure legal foundation for the trivial name *flava* Vieillot, 1817 (as published in the binominal combination *Campephaga flava*), and for this purpose the Standing Committee propose in the annexed application that the International Commission should use its plenary powers for the purpose of suppressing the earlier trivial name *sulphuratus* Lichtenstein, 1793 (as published in the binominal combination *Cuculus sulphuratus*). It must be noted however that, as shown by Meise and Stresemann in their paper published in the *Ibis* in 1950 (extracts from which are incorporated in the application now submitted), Lichtenstein was in doubt as to whether the bird which he was describing was a cuckoo or a shrike. In addition to giving this bird the name *Cuculus sulphuratus*, he therefore gave it also the name *Lanius flavescens*. The application now submitted by the

Standing Committee is therefore to be taken as constituting a request for the suppression, under the plenary powers, of the trivial name *flavescens* Lichtenstein, 1793, as well as of *sulphuratus* Lichtenstein, 1793.

The specific action which the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is now asked to take is thus that it should :—

(1) use its plenary powers to suppress the under-mentioned trivial names for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy :—

  (*a*) *cafra* Lichtenstein, 1793 (as published in the combination *Otis cafra*) ;

  (*b*) *cafer* Lichtenstein, 1793 (as published in the combination *Cuculus cafer*) ;

  (*c*) *sulphuratus* Lichtenstein, 1793 (as published in the combination *Cuculus sulphuratus*) ;

  (*d*) *flavescens* Lichtenstein, 1793 (as published in the combination *Lanius flavescens*) ;

(2) place the under-mentioned trivial names on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology ;*—

  (*a*) *barrowi* Gray (J.E.), 1829 (as published in the combination *Otis barrowi*) ;

  (*b*) *clamosus* Latham, 1801 (as published in the combination *Cuculus clamosus*) ;

  (*c*) *flava* Vieillot, 1817 (as published in the combination *Campephaga flava*) ;

(3) place the four trivial names specified in (1) above, as there proposed to be suppressed under the plenary powers, on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology.*

ENCLOSURE

Three trivial names published for birds by Lichenstein (A.) in 1793 proposed to be suppressed under the plenary powers

(1) The trivial name comprised in the specific name *Otis cafra* Lichtenstein (A.), 1793, *Cat. Rer. nat. rarissim.* : 36.

It is recommended that the above name should be made a *nomen rejectum* and that the trivial name comprised in the name currently accepted for this species, namely, *Otis barrowi* Gray (J. E.), 1829, *in* Griffith's Cuvier's *Animal Kingdom* **8** Aves **3** : 304 (" Cape of Good Hope "), be made a *nomen conservandum.*

(2) The trivial name comprised in the specific name *Cuculus cafer* Lichtenstein (A.), 1793, *Cat. Reh. nat. rarissim.* : 14.

It is recommended that the above name should be made a *nomen rejectum* and that the trivial name comprised in the name currently accepted for this species, namely *Cuculus clamosus* Latham, 1801, *Index Orn.*, Suppl. **1** : XXX (" Cape of Good Hope "), be made a *nomen conservandum.*

(3) The trivial name comprised in the specific name *Cuculus sulphuratus* Lichtenstein (A.), 1793, *Cat. Rer. nat. rarissim.* : 15.

It is recommended that the above name should be made a *nomen rejectum* and that the trivial name comprised in the name currently accepted for this species, namely *Campephaga flava* Vieillot, 1817, *Nouv. Dict. Hist. nat.* **10** : 49 (" South Africa "), be made a *nomen conservandum.*

The circumstances of the present case have been discussed by Meise and Stresemann in a paper published in 1950 (*Ibis* **92** : 22-26), from which extracts have been made for the information of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and are submitted in the Annexe to the present application.

R. MEINERTZHAGEN : *Chairman of the Standing Committee.*

E. STRESEMANN : *Zoologisches Museum der Universität, Berlin.*

JOHN T. ZIMMER* : *The American Museum of Natural History, New York.* (items 1 and 2 only).

**Note by Dr. John T. Zimmer on Case No.* 3 (*extract from a letter dated* 3*rd April,* 1951) : The case on which I differed from other members of the Standing Committee may be covered by a single statement. I did not feel that any serious confusion would result from the adoption of the newly discovered name. The change is perhaps unfortunate, as all such changes are, but is likely to cause no more than temporary inconvenience.

ANNEXE TO APPLICATION

Extract from a paper by Meise & Stresemann published in 1950 ("Ibis" 92 : 22-26)

During the last days of October 1793 a large collection of mounted birds . . . was dispersed by auction at Eimbeck's sale house at Hamburg. The contents were made known to the public by a sale catalogue prepared by Dr. Anton August Heinrich Lichtenstein (1753-1816) . . . At the time of this sale, A. A. H. Lichtenstein was headmaster of a famous classical college at Hamburg . . . and his little pamphlet "Catalogus Rerum naturalium rarissimarum," containing the description of several new species, was commented upon in contemporary reviews.

It has long been supposed that many of the specimens listed in the "Catalogus" were collected in South Africa by Francois Levaillant during his stay from 1781-1784, yet Godman had to confess that he was quite at a loss regarding the former owner of this remarkable Cabinet. It is only now that the mystery of more than 150 years can be unveiled. All these valuable mammals, birds, shells, and insects had formed the Cabinet of L. F. Holthuizen, a wealthy Dutchman living at Amsterdam, whose collection had been praised by Levaillant ("Oiseaux d'Afrique, 1," 1796, 4to, p. 56) in the following terms : "à Amsterdam, on voit encore le cabinet très-nombreux d'oiseaux, du citoyen Holthuyzen, qui possède aussi une grande et belle suite de papillons et d'insectes."

A remark of the younger Lichtenstein, contained in the biography of his father . . . where it is expressly stated that the latter catalogued the Holthuizen collection, led to the final solution of the riddle . . . It has been this accidental discovery that induced us to study the catalogue with critical eyes, whereby it soon became apparent that this had only very seldom been done by others.

Holthuizen seems to have bought his specimens from many sources ; . . . A good many (47 species) came from Cayenne, but no other part of the world had contributed to it as much as South Africa : 60 species. It can hardly be doubted that most, if not all, of them had been collected there by Levaillant . . . Levaillant must have sold these birds to Holthuizen during the years 1785 to 1790—at the same time that another part of his collection went to Jacob Temminck and Joan Raye van Breukelerwaard, both equally of Amsterdam.

A. Lichtenstein had but very little practice in determining birds, yet the number of new species he dared to describe . . . amounted to 38, 17 of which are stated to have come from South Africa. They are the following :—

. . . .

5. *Otis cafra* nobis (p. 36), "Caffernland." Owing to the misinterpretation of A. Lichtenstein's original description (1793) by H. Lichtenstein in 1823, the name *Otis cafra* has been accepted to designate the large "Veld Paauw" of the Boers. However from examination of the 1793 "Catalogus" it becomes apparent that a small species of Bustard was meant, and that the description exactly fits the species named *Otis barrowi* by Gray (though most inappropriately, since John Barrow's "Wild

Peacock " was the large species hitherto called *Otis cafra*). Unless A. Lichtenstein's *Otis cafra* is voted an obligatory synonym of the later *Otis* . . . , our discovery is going to have deplorable consequences. . . .

. . . .

8. *Cuculus cafer* nobis (p. 14), " terra Cafrirum." This name was forgotten up to 1870, when Sharpe (" Ibis," 1870 : 58) applied it to the species up to then incorrectly named *Coccystes* afer (Leach). Sharpe apparently never gave the reasons for his change in nomenclature, which soon was adopted by all ornithologists, although the original description at a glance reveals the error. In reality Lichtenstein had before him a bird which was not crested and " corpore supra splendide atro, infra fusco undulato. Remiges et retrices splendide nigrae maculatis exalbidis . . . Kopf, Nacken und Rücken sind glänzend schwarz ; Brust und Unterleib sind braun gewellet. . . ." Such barred specimens of *Cuculus* clamosus occur in South Africa (Stark & Sclater, " Birds South Africa," 3 (1903) : 192). Therefore the synonymy will be :—

Cuculus cafer A. Lichtenstein
Cuculus cafer A. Lichtenstein, " Cat. Rer. nat." 1793 : 14
Cuculus clamosus Latham, " Ind. Orn." Suppl. 1 (1801) : xxx
Clamator levaillanti (Swainson)
Cuculus afer Leach, " Zool. Misc." 1 (1814) : 72, tab. 31 nec *Cuculus afer* Gmelin, " Syst. Nat." 1 : 418, 1788 (which is *Leptosomus discolor* (Hermann 1783))
Coccyzus levaillanti Swainson, " Zool. Ill." (2) 1 : 3, 1829, tab. 13
Cuculus cafer Sharpe 1870 et auct. seq., but not of A. Lichtenstein.

9. " ? *Cuculus sulphuratus* nobis ; vel potius *Lanius flavescens* ? " (p. 15). " Hab. in terra Caffrorum." A. Lichtenstein had been in doubt whether this Cuckoo-shrike was really a cuckoo or rather a yellowish shrike. His description is clearly that of the female of *Campephaga flava* Vieillot. This implies the following change (unless the current name is ranked among the *nomina conservanda* by some international body).

Campephaga sulphurata (A. Lichtenstein)

Cuculus sulphuratus A. Lichtenstein 1793 (" terra Cafrorum," descr. ♀).

Campephaga flava Vieillot 1817 (South Africa, ex Levaillant, descr. ♀).

Campephaga nigra Vieillot 1817 (South Africa, ex Levaillant, descr. ♂).

. . . .

Suggestions

In accordance with their postulate that changes in current nomenclature ought to be avoided as far as possible, the authors suggest :—

1. Discarding altogether those names which had been misinterpreted for a century, instead of connecting them in future with their original, and therefore proper, species. If one applies this to the names *Otis cafra* (A. Lichtenstein) and *Cuculus cafer* (A. Lichtenstein), changes in the nomenclature of the genera *Eupodotis* and *Cuculus* will be prevented.

2. Ranking *Campephaga flava* Vieillot among the *nomina conservanda*, with *Cuculus sulphuratus* (A. Lichtenstein) an obligatory synonym of it.

PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO SUPPRESS THE TRIVIAL NAME "NORTONIENSIS" GMELIN, 1789 (AS PUBLISHED IN THE BINOMINAL COMBINATION "FRINGILLA NORTONIENSIS" (CLASS AVES))

Application submitted by the
Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature of the International Ornithological Congress

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)527)

Covering letter, with enclosure, dated 19th October, 1950, from Colonel R. Meinertzhagen, Chairman of the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature

As Chairman of the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature, I beg to forward to you the annexed recommendation relating to the name *Fringilla nortoniensis* Gmelin, 1789, for favour of decision by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

The circumstances of the present case were described by Dr. E. Stresemann, a Member of the Standing Committee, in a paper entitled "Birds collected in the North Pacific Area during Capt. James Cook's last Voyage (1778 and 1779)," published in 1949 (Stresemann, 1949, *Ibis* **91** : 252), an extract from which is given in the Annexe to the application now submitted.

The specific action which the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is asked to take in this case is : (1) that it should use its plenary powers to suppress the trivial name *nortoniensis* Gmelin, 1789 (as published in the combination *Fringilla nortoniensis*) for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy ; (2) place the trivial name *pyrrhulinus* Swinhoe, 1876 (as published in the combination *Emberiza pyrrhulinus*) on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology*, and (3) place the trivial name *nortoniensis* Gmelin, 1789 (as published in the combination *Fringilla nortoniensis*), as proposed, in (1) above, to be suppressed under the plenary powers, on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology*.

ENCLOSURE

The trivial name comprised in the specific name "Fringilla nortoniensis" Gmelin, 1789

It is recommended that the trivial name (*nortoniensis*) comprised in the specific name *Fringilla nortoniensis* Gmelin, 1789 (*in* Linnaeus, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 13) **1**(2) : 922) be made a *nomen rejectum* and that the trivial name (*pyrrhulina*) comprised in the name currently accepted for this species, namely

Emberiza pyrrhulinus Swinhoe, 1876, *Ibis* (3) **5** : 333, pl. VIII, fig. 2 (" Hakodati ") be made a *nomen conservandum*.

The trivial name *pyrrhulinus* Swinhoe, 1876, has been in continuous use for three quarters of a century, while the name *nortoniensis* Gmelin, 1789, has been completely overlooked. The introduction of Gmelin's long-forgotten name *nortoniensis* would give rise to confusion and would be open to strong objection.

Attached to the present application is an extract from a paper by Dr. E. Stresemann published in 1949 (*Ibis* **91** : 252) in which the trivial name *nortoniensis* Gmelin was first synonymised with *pyrrhulinus* Swinhoe.

R. MEINERTZHAGEN : *Chairman of the Standing Committee.*

E. STRESEMANN : *Zoologisches Museum der Universität, Berlin.*

JOHN T. ZIMMER : *The American Museum of Natural History, New York.*

ANNEXE TO APPLICATION

Extract from a paper entitled " Birds collected in the North Pacific Area during Capt. James Cook's last Voyage (1778 and 1779) " (Stresemann, 1949, " Ibis " 91 : 244-255)

[The birds discussed in the above paper are grouped by reference to the localities in which they were observed, and the dates on which these localities were visited on Captain Cook's voyage. The bird dealt with in the present application is discussed in the tenth of these groups which is lettered " J." and is concerned with birds observed in Kamschatka.]

J. KAMTSCHATKA : 28th April to 4th June, 1779 and 24th August to 9th October, 1779.

(1) [*Emberiza schoeniclus pyrrhulinus* Swinhoe, 1876] *Fringilla nortoniensis* Gmelin, 1(2) : 922 (1789), ex " Norton Finch," Pennant, 2 : 376. " Discovered in Norton Sound." Locality wrong. The specimen described by Pennant is a male in fresh autumn plumage (lacking the outermost pair of tail feathers) of the Kamschatka race of the Reed Bunting.

PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO SUPPRESS SEVEN TRIVIAL NAMES PUBLISHED BY GMELIN IN 1788 AND 1789 FOR BIRDS WHICH UNTIL 1950 REMAINED UNIDENTIFIED

Application submitted by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature of the International Ornithological Congress

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)454)

Covering letter, dated 19th October, 1950, with enclosure, from Colonel R. Meinertzhagen, Chairman of the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature of the International Ornithological Congress

As Chairman of the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature, I beg to forward to you the following recommendations for favour of decision by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

The recommendations now submitted relate to seven trivial names published by Gmelin in 1789 for birds taken on Captain Cook's Last Expedition. None of these names has been used by ornithologists, for the species so named have always been considered unrecognizable until in 1950 Dr. Erwin Stresemann, a member of the Standing Committee, established the identity of the species in question (Stresemann, 1950, *Auk* **67** : 66-88). In the opinion of the majority of the members of the Committee it is desirable that all the seven names listed in the enclosure to the present letter should be suppressed by the International Commission, the corresponding names now in use for the species concerned being at the same time placed on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology*. One member of the Standing Committee (Dr. John T. Zimmer), while concurring with the other members of the Committee as regards five of the seven names concerned, does not support the recommendation submitted in the two other names, namely the trivial name *eimeensis* Gmelin, 1789 (as published in the binominal combination *Columba eimeensis*) and the trivial name *australis* Gmelin, 1789 (as published in the binominal combination *Sterna australis*).

The action which the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is asked to take is that it should :—

(1) use its plenary powers to suppress the under-mentioned trivial names for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy :—
  (*a*) *eimeensis* Gmelin, 1789 (as published in the combination *Columba eimeensis*) ;
  (*b*) *unalaschkensis* Gmelin, 1789 (as published in the combination *Hirundo unalaschkensis*) ;
  (*c*) *natka* Gmelin, 1788 (as published in the combination *Lanius natka*) ;
  (*d*) *septentrionalis* Gmelin, 1788 (as published in the combination *Lanius septentrionalis*) ;
  (*e*) *borealis* Gmelin, 1789 (as published in the combination *Motacilla borealis*) ;
  (*f*) *cirrhatus* Gmelin, 1789 (as published in the combination *Pelecanus cirrhatus*) ;
  (*g*) *australis* Gmelin, 1789 (as published in the combination *Sterna australis*) ;

(2) place the under-mentioned trivial names on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* :—
  (*a*) *stairi* Gray (G.R.), 1856 (as published in the combination *Caloenas* (*Phlegoenas*) *stairi*) ;
  (*b*) *townsendi* Oberholser, 1906 (as published in the combination *Collocalla francica townsendi*) ;
  (*c*) *pacificus* Gmelin, 1789 (as published in the combination *Turdus pacificus*) ;
  (*d*) *heinei* Finsch & Hartlaub, 1870 (as published in the combination *Myolestes heinei*) ;
  (*e*) *sepium* Horsfield, 1821 (as published in the combination *Orthotomus sepium*) ;
  (*f*) *albiventer* Lesson, 1831 (as published in the combination *Carbo albiventer*) ;
  (*g*) *cerulea* Bennett (F.D.), 1840 (as published in the combination *Sterna cerulea*) ;

(3) place on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* the seven trivial names specified in (1), as there proposed to be suppressed under the plenary powers.

ENCLOSURE

Seven trivial names published for birds by Gmelin in 1789 proposed to be suppressed under the plenary powers

1. The trivial name comprised in the specific name *Columba eimeensis* Gmelin, 1789, *in* Linnaeus, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 13) **1** (2) : 784.

   It is recommended that the above name should be made a *nomen rejectum* and that the trivial name comprised in the name currently accepted for this species, namely *Caloenas* (*Phlegoenas*) *stairi* Gray (G. R.), [1856], *Proc. zool. Soc. Lond.* **24** (301) : 7 (" Samoa ") be made a *nomen conservandum.* See Stresemann, 1950, *Auk* **67** : 75.

2. The trivial name comprised in the specific name *Hirundo unalaschkensis* Gmelin, 1789, *in* Linnaeus, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 13) **1** (2) : 1025.

   It is recommended that the above name should be made a *nomen rejectum* and that the subspecific trivial name comprised in the name currently accepted for this subspecies, namely *Collocalla francica townsendi* Oberholser, 1906, *Proc. Acad. nat. Sci. Philad.* **58** : 181 (" Tonga Islands ") be made a *nomen conservandum.* See Stresemann, 1950, *Auk* **67** : 74.

3. The trivial name comprised in the specific name *Lanius natka* Gmelin, 1788, *in* Linnaeus, *ibid.* **1** (1) : 309.

   It is recommended that the above name should be made a *nomen rejectum* and that the trivial name comprised in the name currently accepted for this species, namely *Turdus pacificus* Gmelin, 1789, *in* Linnaeus, *ibid.* **1** (2) : 813, be made a *nomen conservandum.* See Stresemann, 1950, *Auk* **67** : 73.

4. The trivial name comprised in the specific name *Lanius septentrionalis* Gmelin, 1788, *in* Linnaeus, *ibid.* **1** (1) : 306.

   It is recommended that the above name should be made a *nomen rejectum* and that the trivial name comprised in the name currently accepted for this species, namely *Myolestes heinei* Finsch & Hartlaub, 1870, *Proc. zool. Soc. Lond.* **1869** : 546 (" Tonga Islands "), be made a *nomen conservandum.* See Stresemann, 1950, *Auk* **67** : 73-74.

5. The trivial names comprised in the specific names *Motacilla borealis* Gmelin, 1789, *in* Linnaeus, *ibid.* **1** (2) : 986, and *Motacilla camtschatkensis* Gmelin, 1789, *in* Linnaeus, *ibid.* **1** (2) : 986.

   It is recommended that the above names (which apply to the same species) should be made *nomina rejecta* and that the trivial name comprised in the name currently accepted for this species, namely *Orthotomus sepium* Horsfield, 1821, *Trans. linn. Soc. Lond.* **13** (1) : 166 (" Java ") be made a *nomen conservandum.* See Stresemann, 1950, *Auk* **67** : 81-82.

6. The trivial name comprised in the specific name *Pelecanus cirrhatus* Gmelin, 1789, *in* Linnaeus, *ibid.* **1** (2) : 576.

   It is recommended that the above name should be made a *nomen rejectum* and that the trivial name comprised in the trivial name comprised in the name currently accepted for this species, namely *Carbo albiventer* Lesson, 1831, *Traité Orn.* (8) : 604 (" Falkland Islands "), be made a *nomen conservandum.* See Stresemann, 1950, *Auk* **67** : 83.

7. The trivial name comprised in the specific name *Sterna australis* Gmelin, 1789, *in* Linnaeus, *ibid.* **1** (2) : 608.

   It is recommended that the above name should be made a *nomen rejectum* and that the trivial name comprised in the name currently accepted for this species, namely *Sterna cerulea* Bennett (F. D.), 1840, *Narr. Whaling Voy.* **2** : 248 (" Christmas Island ") be made a *nomen conservandum.* See Stresemann, 1950, *Auk* **67** : 78.

R. MEINERTZHAGEN : *Chairman of the Standing Committee.*
E. STRESEMANN : *Zoologisches Museum der Universität, Berlin.*
JOHN T. ZIMMER* : *The American Museum of Natural History, New York.* (except items 1 and 7)

**Note by Dr. John T. Zimmer on Cases Nos. 1 and 7* (*extract from a letter dated* 3rd *April,* 1951): The cases on which I differed from other members of the Standing Committee may be covered by a single statement. I did not feel that any serious confusion would result from the adoption of the newly discovered name. The change is perhaps unfortunate, as all such changes are, but is likely to cause no more than temporary inconvenience.

PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO VALIDATE THE TRIVIAL NAME "ELEGANS" GOULD, 1837 (AS PUBLISHED IN THE BINOMINAL COMBINATION "MALURUS ELEGANS") (CLASS AVES)

By H. M. WHITTELL, O.B.E.

(*On behalf of the Checklist Committee of the Royal Australasian Ornithologists' Union.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)341)

The Checklist Committee of the Royal Australasian Ornithologists' Union petitions the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to use its plenary powers to suppress the trivial name *elegans* Forster (J.R.), 1794, *Mag. merkwurd. neuen Reise Beschr.* **5** : 128 (as published in the binominal combination *Motacilla elegans*) and thereby to validate the trivial name *elegans* Gould (J.), 1837, *Birds Australia and adj. Islands* (1) : pl. 2 (as published in the binominal combination *Malurus elegans*), on the ground that the strict application of the *Règles* in this case would lead to confusion rather than stability.

2. In 1837, John Gould introduced the name *Malurus elegans* for a Western Australian bird, for which this name has been in use ever since—for a period of over 110 years.

3. In 1937, however, Mr. T. Iredale pointed out (*The Emu* **37** : 95-99) that in 1794 J. R. Forster, in his *Magazin von merkwurdigen neuen Reise Beschreibungen* applied the name *Motacilla elegans* to a different bird, namely that to which in 1783 (*Gen. syn. Birds* **2**(2) : 581) Latham had applied the name *Motacilla cyanea*.

4. The two birds discussed above are currently regarded as belonging to the same genus, and in consequence the name *elegans* Gould, 1837, is invalid, being a junior secondary homonym of the name *elegans* Forster, 1794. The strict applications of the *Règles* in the present case would cause great confusion, for it would not only mean that the Western Australian bird would be deprived of the name by which it has been universally known since 1837 but would also involve the transfer of the name *elegans* to another species in the same genus. This would be a very high price to pay for the sake of bringing into use the name *elegans* Forster, 1794, which has never had any currency, virtually the only reference to it in the literature being in the account given in Iredale in 1937.

5. It is for the foregoing reasons that the International Commission is asked to take the action specified in the first paragraph of the present Commission. The Commission is asked at the same time (1) to place the trivial name *elegans* Gould, 1837 (as published in the binominal combination *Malurus elegans*) on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology*, and (2) to place the trivial name *elegans* Forster, 1794 (as published in the binominal combination *Motacilla elegans*) on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology.*

PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO SUPPRESS FOR NOMENCLATORIAL PURPOSES A PAPER BY FORSTER (J. R.) CONTAINING NEW NAMES FOR CERTAIN AUSTRALIAN BIRDS PUBLISHED IN 1794 IN VOLUME 5 OF THE " MAGAZIN VON MERKWÜRDIGEN NEUEN REISE BESCHREIBUNGEN "

By ERNST MAYR (*The American Museum of Natural History, New York*),
DEAN AMADON (*The American Museum of Natural History, New York*),
JEAN DELACOUR (*The American Museum of Natural History, New York*),
L. GLAVERT (*Natural History Museum, Perth, Western Australia*),
ROBERT CUSHMAN MURPHY (*The American Museum of Natural History, New York*),
D. L. SERVENTY (*Nedlands, Western Australia*),
H. M. WHITTELL, O.B.E. (*Bridgetown, Western Australia*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)494)

(Communicated on 19th October, 1950, by Colonel R. Meinertzhagen, Chairman of the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature of the International Ornithological Congress)

The occasional discovery of long-forgotten scientific names has been exceedingly unsettling for scientific nomenclature. To correct this evil, the International Zoological Congress at Monaco adopted in 1913 the so-called Monaco Resolution which permits the setting aside of the Rule of Priority whenever its application results clearly in greater confusion than uniformity. Even though this opportunity to save well-established names has been available since 1913, ornithologists have only rarely taken advantage of it. The International Ornithological Congress at Uppsala, 1950, appointed a committee of bird taxonomists to collaborate with the International Commission of Zoological Nomenclature and, in particular, to call attention to names which are in need of preservation in accordance with the Monaco Resolution.

2. The names of some Australian birds seem to require action under the Monaco Resolution. In 1937 (*Emu* **37** : 95-99) Tom Iredale called attention to an overlooked paper by J. R. Forster published in 1794 in German as an appendix to a description of the new British colonies in Australia (*Magazin von merkwürdigen neuen Reise Beschreibungen* **5** : 128). This publication contains fifteen new scientific names which were analysed by Iredale who found that only four have priority over names now in use. Furthermore, one of them, namely *Alcedo collaris* Forster, 1794, is a homonym of *Alcedo collaris* Scopoli, 1786 (*Deliciae Florae Faunae insubricae* **2** : 90) and was therefore stillborn at the time of its publication.

3. Iredale analysed in detail the status of the other three names with the following results :—

(1) *Turdus phaeus* Forster, 1794, has seven years' priority over *Turdus harmonicus* Latham, 1801 (*Index Orn.*, Suppl. : xii), the well-known name of the Grey Shrikethrush called *Colluricincla harmonica* for over 130 years. To replace this well-established name at the present time would clearly be most unfortunate, and we request therefore the International Commission to make use of its plenary powers to place the name *Turdus harmonicus* Latham, 1801, on the list of *nomina conservanda* and the name *Turdus phacus* Forster, 1794, on the list of *nomina rejecta*.

(2) Action in the second case is even more important. Forster gives the name *Motacilla elegans* to the bird now called *Malurus cyaneus australis* North, 1904. If Forster's name is accepted this bird would receive the name *Malurus cyaneus elegans* Forster. However, Gould proposed the name *Malurus elegans* in 1837 for a Western Australian bird for which it has been in use for more than 100 years. A transfer of the name *elegans* from the Western Australian species to the eastern one would cause severe confusion. We request therefore the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to make use of its plenary powers and place *Malurus elegans* Gould, 1837 (*Birds Austr.* (1) : pl. 2) on the list of *nomina conservanda* and *Motacilla elegans* Forster, 1794, on the list of *nomina rejecta*.

(3) The third name is *Muscicapa chlorotis* Forster, 1794, for a bird generally called *Muscicapa* [=*Meliphaga*] *chrysops* (Latham, 1801) (=*Sylvia chrysops* Latham, 1801, *Index Ornith.*, Suppl. : liv), but which Iredale states to be antedated by *Muscicapa novaehollandiae* Latham, 1790 (*Index Orn.* : 478).

4. Recommendation ; The publication in which Forster proposes these names is apparently exceedingly rare. It does not appear to be in the library of the British Museum (Natural History), and these scientific names are not included in Sherborn's *Index Animalium*. The simplest way to deal with this publication would be to classify all the names published in this volume as *nomina rejecta*. The ornithologists whose names appear at the head of this application suggest this action to the International Commission.

ON THE QUESTION WHETHER IT IS NECESSARY THAT THE PLENARY POWERS SHOULD BE USED TO SUPPRESS THE TRIVIAL NAME "NOVAEHOLLANDIAE" LATHAM, 1790 (AS PUBLISHED IN THE COMBINATION "MUSCICAPA NOVAEHOLLANDIAE") IN ORDER TO MAKE AVAILABLE THE TRIVIAL NAME "CHRYSOPS" LATHAM, 1801 (AS PUBLISHED IN THE COMBINATION "SYLVIA CHRYSOPS") (CLASS AVES)

By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.
(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)494)

1. When I received the application submitted to the International Commission for the use of the plenary powers to suppress three trivial names published for Australian birds by Forster (J. R.) in 1794, it seemed to me that further clarification was needed as regards the third of the cases submitted, for it was not clear that the action recommended would be sufficient to secure the purpose of the applicants, namely to ensure that the trivial name *chrysops* Latham, 1801 (as published in the binominal combination *Sylvia chrysops*) should be the oldest trivial name available (both objectively and subjectively) for the bird to which it is currently applied. For the applicants pointed out that the nominal species *Sylvia chrysops* Latham, 1801, had been subjectively identified by Iredale not only with the nominal species *Muscicapa chlorotis* Forster, 1794, but also with the older nominal species *Muscicapa novaehollandiae* Latham, 1790. The suppression (as proposed) of the trivial name *chlorotis* Forster, 1794, would, therefore, not suffice to provide availability for the trivial name *chrysops* Latham, 1801.

2. With the approval of Colonel R. Meinertzhagen (through whom this application had been submitted to the Commission), I accordingly decided to raise this question with Dr. Ernst Mayr (American Museum of Natural History, New York), the first of the signatories to the application submitted to the International Commission. When my letter reached New York, Dr. Mayr had left on a visit to Europe. On receiving my letter, he answered direct from Europe and at the same time sent my letter back to Dr. Dean Amadon at the American Museum. A little later Dr. Amadon wrote me a letter quoting the views expressed on this subject by Dr. D. L. Serventy (Nedlands, Western Australia) in a letter to Dr. Mayr and at the same time adding a note of his own views on the question at issue. The views of these specialists are set out in the following paragraphs.

3. *View of Dr. Ernst Mayr* (*letter dated* 7*th April*, 1951) : Dr. Mayr wrote :—

> What a pity your letter did not reach me before I left New York. . . . Most authors considered *novahollandiae* Latham, 1790, up to now as unidentifiable (a *nomen dubium*) and there are indeed some outright contradictions in the description, if the name really applies to *chrysops*. However Serventy wrote me recently that the name was based on some paintings and that these paintings represent *chrysops* undoubtedly. You are therefore entirely correct that it would be wiser to outlaw also the name *novaehollandiae*. This is indeed what Serventy proposed to me by letter. You have my full authority to act along the line of your suggestion.

4. *View of Dr. D. L. Serventy, expressed in a letter to Dr. Ernst Mayr* (*communicated by Dr. Dean Amadon in a letter dated* 11*th April*, 1951) : In a letter, dated 11th April, 1951, Dr. Dean Amadon quoted the following passage from a letter previously received by Dr. Ernst Mayr from Dr. D. L. Serventy :—

> Your paragraph on the name *Muscicapa novaehollandiae* is strictly logical if one can confine oneself to the written word. Unfortunately, the name is based also on the coloured plate and a textual description in a work by John White " Journal of a Voyage to New South Wales," an extract from which I enclose.
>
> You will see that certain portions of White's original description are omitted by Latham. The plate, which is in colour, is not a very good one but I think it can be accepted to represent the bird we now know as *Meliphaga chrysops*. In the plate the bill is shown as being down-curved and is black at the base and tip. The most striking discrepancy between the plate and the actual bird is the absence of the black lines at the side of the head but this may have been due to the fact that the head on the plate is very dark except for the yellow ear coverts.
>
> My copy of White was bought some years ago from Tom Iredale who told me that it was one of the original copies owned by Mathews. There are several annotations in pencil by Mathews in it and the plate of the Yellow-eared Flycatcher is labelled in Mathews's hand-writing as *M. ornata*. This is the view which Mathews also held in his " Birds of Australia," vol. 2, but in the 1931 list he used *novaehollandiae* as the prior name for *M. chrysops*.
>
> It is quite impossible that the bird figured by White might have been *M. ornata* which is an inland bird in New South Wales. The only two possibilities are *M. fusca* or *M. chrysops*, and the bird represented to me appears to be the latter.
>
> I think that the only thing to do now is to endeavour to place the name *Muscicapa novaehollandiae* on the list of *nomina rejecta*.

5. *Comment by Dr. Dean Amadon* (*letter dated* 11*th April*, 1951) : In the letter containing the foregoing extract from the letter from Dr. Serventy quoted in the preceding paragraph, Dr. Amadon added the following comment :

> You will see from this that Serventy believes that this name *Muscicapa*

novaehollandiae Latham, 1790, applies to the bird now known as *Meliphaga chrysops* and thinks that the name *novaehollandiae*, as well as *chlorotis*, should be declared *nomina rejecta*. It may be emphasised that there is some doubt still as to whether the name *novaehollandiae* actually does refer to the species in question.

6. Conclusion : It is evident from the foregoing statements that, although there is still room for difference of opinion regarding the identity of the species represented by the name *Muscicapa novaehollandiae* Latham, 1790, the likelihood of the species in question being the same as that represented by the nominal species *Sylvia chrysops* Latham, 1801, is so great that, so long as the first of these names remains available nomenclatorially, it will never be possible to secure the object sought by the applicants, namely that the trivial name *chrysops* Latham shall be unquestionably the oldest available trivial name for the bird now known as *Meliphaga chrysops* (Latham, 1801).

SUPPORT BY THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON ORNITHOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE OF THE INTERNATIONAL ORNITHOLOGICAL CONGRESS FOR THE PROPOSALS SUBMITTED BY DR. ERNST MAYR AND OTHERS FOR THE USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO SUPPRESS FOR NOMENCLATORIAL PURPOSES A PAPER CONTAINING NEW NAMES FOR CERTAIN AUSTRALIAN BIRDS PUBLISHED BY FORSTER IN 1794

Communication received from the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature of the International Ornithological Congress

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)494)

Letter dated 4th April 1952 from Colonel R. Meinertzhagen,
Chairman of the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature
of the International Ornithological Congress

On 19th October 1950 I forwarded to you, for favour of decision by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, an application which had been sent to me, as Chairman of the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature, by Dr. Ernst Mayr and others, asking the International Commission to use its plenary powers for the purpose of suppressing, for nomenclatorial purposes, a paper containing new names by J. R. Forster for certain Australian birds published in 1794 in volume 5 of the *Magazin von merkwürdigen neuen Reise Beschreibungen.*

I have now to inform you that the proposals drawn up by Dr. Mayr have since been examined by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature, each member of which has signed the attached copy of Dr. Mayr's application. In the name of the Standing Committee (Professor Berlioz, Dr. Stresemann, Dr. Zimmer and myself) I accordingly beg to ask you to inform the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature that the foregoing application has the full support of the Standing Committee.

In the case of the third of the names dealt with in the foregoing application, the International Commission is asked to treat the application as one for the suppression not only of the trivial name *chlorotis* Forster, 1794 (as published in the binominal combination *Muscicapa chlorotis*) but also of the trivial name *novaehollandiae* Latham, 1790 (as published in the binominal combination *Muscicapa novaehollandiae*), since, as explained in the application, the identification by Iredale of Latham's *novaehollandiae* constitutes just as much a threat to the name (*chrysops*) commonly applied to this species as does Forster's name *chlorotis*.

The action which the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is asked to take is that it should :—

(1) use its plenary powers to suppress :—

(*a*) the trivial name *elegans* Forster, 1794 (as published in the combination *Motacilla elegans*) for the purposes both of the Law of Priority and of the Law of Homonymy ;

(*b*) the under-mentioned trivial names for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy :—

(i) *phaeus* Forster, 1794 (as published in the combination *Turdus phaeus*) ;

(ii) *chlorotis* Forster, 1794 (as published in the combination *Muscicapa chlorotis*) ;

(iii) *novaehollandiae* Latham, 1790 (as published in the combination *Muscicapa novaehollandiae*) ;

(2) place the under-mentioned trivial names on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* :—

(*a*) *harmonicus* Latham, 1801 (as published in the combination *Turdus harmonicus*) ;

(*b*) *elegans* Gould, 1837 (as published in the combination *Malurus elegans*) ;

(*c*) *chrysops* Latham, 1801 (as published in the combination *Sylvia chrysops*) ;

(3) place on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* the four trivial names specified in (1) above, as there proposed to be suppressed under the plenary powers.

PROPOSED EMENDATION, UNDER ARTICLE 19, OF THE TRIVIAL NAMES OF THREE SPECIES OF BIRD WHICH, WHEN FIRST PUBLISHED, WERE INCORRECTLY SPELT

Application submitted by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature of the International Ornithological Congress

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)491)

Covering letter dated 19th October, 1950, with enclosure, from Colonel R. Meinertzhagen, Chairman of the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature of the International Ornithological Congress

As Chairman of the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature, I beg to forward to you the following recommendation relating to the acceptance of emendations of the trivial names of three bird species for favour of decision by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

Each of the trivial names concerned is the oldest available for the species concerned, and it is accordingly recommended that these three names, when emended, should be placed on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology.*

ENCLOSURE

Proposed correction of faulty orthography in the case of the trivial names of three species of bird

Alauda brachydactila Leisler, 1814, *Annalen der Wetterautschen Gesellschaft für die Gesammte Naturkunde* **3**(2) : 357.
Vultur perenopterus Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 87.
Tringa ocrophus Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 149.

These names, as originally spelled, are faulty Latin, they offend the cultured mind and are meaningless.

Under Article 19, these names should be regarded as cases of "fautes d'orthographe" or "fautes d'impression" and should be emended to read :—

Alauda brachydactyla Leisler.	βραχύς	short.	δακτυλος	toe.
Vultur percnopterus Linnaeus.	περκνος	dusky.	πτερον	wing.
Tringa ochropus Linnaeus.*	ὠχρός	pale yellow.	πους	foot.

R. MEINERTZHAGEN : *Chairman of the Standing Committee.*
J. BERLIOZ : *Museum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris.*
E. STRESEMANN : *Zoologisches Museum der Universität, Berlin.*
JOHN T. ZIMMER : *The American Museum of Natural History, New York.*

---

*See also in this connection pp. 75-76.

PROPOSED VALIDATION UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS OF THE GENERIC NAME "PYRRHOCORAX" TUNSTALL, 1771 (CLASS AVES) FOR THE CHOUGH

Application submitted by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature of the International Ornithological Congress

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)492)

Covering letter, dated 19th October, 1950, with enclosures, from Colonel R. Meinertzhagen, Chairman of the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature of the International Ornithological Congress

As Chairman of the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature, I beg to forward to you the following recommendation for favour of decision by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

ENCLOSURE 1

Proposed validation under the plenary powers of the generic name "Pyrrhocorax" Tunstall, 1771

Pyrrhocorax Tunstall, 1771, *Orn. Brit.* : 2. Type species of genus by monotypy : *Upupa pyrrhocorax* Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 188.

Coracia Brisson, 1760, *Orn.* **2** : 3 (with same type species).

The name *Pyrrhocorax* has been used for over one hundred years.

Sharpe (1877, *Cat. Birds Brit. Mus.* **3** : 146) rejects *Coracia* owing to its similarity with *Coracias* Linnaeus. It has since been rejected by many authors as being a faulty transliteration of *Coracias*.

The B.O.U. List Committee (1947 *Ibis* **1947** : 354) adopted the name *Coracia* Brisson as the correct name of the genus *Pyrrhocorax* Tunstall. This change can only lead to confusion.

It is hoped that *Pyrrhocorax* Tunstall, 1771 (type species : *Upupa pyrrhocorax* Linnaeus, 1758) be made a *nomen conservandum* and that *Coracia* Brisson be suppressed.

R. MEINERTZHAGEN : *Chairman of the Standing Committee.*

E. STRESEMANN : *Zoologisches Museum der Universität, Berlin.*

JOHN T. ZIMMER : *The American Museum of Natural History, New York.*

ENCLOSURE 2

Note, dated 25th September, 1950, by Professor J. Berlioz (Museum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris)

As concerning *Coracia*, the question seems to me much more difficult [than the questions relating to the trivial name of the Song Thrush and the proposed emendation of certain other trivial names dealt with respectively in Applications Z.N.(S.)493 and Z.N.(S.)491, submitted by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature]. Of course, I myself hate the unnecessary changes in nomenclature. But I believe that the use of the name *Coracias* for the Rollers was adopted at the time when *all* Brisson's names were rejected. Since the generic names given by Brisson were considered as valid by a Zoological Congress, it seems that they must antedate Linné's names given in 1766. So (*most unfortunately, I agree*) *Coracia* would have priority for the Choughs and *Galgulus* for the Rollers. Even *Coracias* cannot be accepted for the latter, as it is clearly stated by Brisson that the Latin *Coracia* is the same as the French " Coracias," and *Galgulus* is perfectly valid for the Rollers.

ON THE APPLICATION RELATING TO THE GENERIC NAMES "PYRRHOCORAX" TUNSTALL, 1771, AND "CORACIA" BRISSON, 1760 (CLASS AVES), SUBMITTED BY THE STANDING COMMITTEE ON ORNITHOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE OF THE INTERNATIONAL ORNITHOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE [illegible]

By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)492)

1. The purpose of the present note is twofold : (1) to clear away certain misapprehensions which it appears from the second of the two enclosures submitted by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature appear to exist regarding the action taken by the International Congress of Zoology and by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in regard to the status of generic names published in Brisson (M.J.), 1760, *Ornithologie ;* (2) to indicate the action which under the established procedure would be necessary in the event of the approval by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of the recommendations in regard to the generic names *Pyrrhocorax* Tunstall, 1771, and *Coracia* Brisson, 1760, submitted to it by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature.

(a) Action taken by the International Congress of Zoology and by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in regard to the status of generic names in Brisson, 1760, " Ornithologie "

2. The question of the availability of the generic names published in 1760 in Brisson's *Ornithologie* was first brought before the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature by the late Dr. Ernst Hartert. The exact date of this application is not known but it was presumably a year or more prior to 1911, the year in which the decision of the International Commission on this subject was published in *Opinion* 37. At that time the International Commission (in common with all other zoologists) was much preoccupied with the problem whether under the *Règles* any status attached to generic names published by authors who applied a so-called " binary " system of nomenclature but who did not apply a binominal system of nomenclature. Shortly before the publication of *Opinion* 37 (in regard to Brisson's names), the International Commission adopted an *Opinion—Opinion* 20, published in July 1910 (*Smithson. Publ.* **1938** : 48-51)—in regard to the status of generic names published in 1763, by the " binary " but not binominal author Gronovius in his work entitled the *Zoophylacium Gronovianum.* In this *Opinion* the International Commission ruled in favour of the availability under the *Règles* of generic names published by " binary " but not binominal authors. Accordingly, when shortly afterwards, the International Commission come to consider Dr. Hartert's application relating to the status of generic names published in 1760 by the " binary " but admittedly not binominal author M. J. Brisson, it ruled that those names were available under the *Règles.* This ruling, embodied (as already noted) in *Opinion* 37 (1911, *Smithson. Publ.* **2013** : 87-88), was published exactly one year after *Opinion* 20, the *Opinion* on which, as the *Opinion* dealing with the question of principle involved, the validity of the ruling in *Opinion* 37 depended.

3. It is not necessary here to recapitulate in detail the long drawn-out controversy which followed the ruling (given in *Opinion* 20) in favour of the availability of generic names published after 1757 by authors who applied a so-called " binary " but not binominal system of nomenclature. It is sufficient to recall that, in the light of the proceedings at the Eleventh International Congress of Zoology at Padua in 1930, the Twelfth Congress at Lisbon in 1935 invited the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to prepare a comprehensive Report on the issues involved for consideration by the Thirteenth Congress and that the Report, so prepared by the International Commission, secured unanimous approval when it was submitted to the Thirteenth Congress at its meeting in Paris in July, 1948. It is in the light of that Report (for the text of which see, 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **5** : 152-167) and of the decisions thereon taken by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and by the International Congress of Zoology that the present status of Brisson's generic names must be judged.

4. As will be seen from the Report referred to above, the International Commission (1) reported that the apparently ambiguous phrase " nomenclature binaire " as used in the substantive French text of the *Règles* was (for the reasons there explained) identical in meaning with the expression " nomenclature binominale" and recommended that the latter expression, being absolutely clear in meaning, should be substituted for the expression "nomenclature binaire," (2) cancelled those of its earlier *Opinions* (including *Opinion* 37, relating to the status of the generic names published by Brisson in 1760 in *Ornithologia*), which were dependent upon *Opinion* 20 and were therefore now seen to be incorrect, but (3) recognising that many of Brisson's generic names were in general use by ornithologists and being anxious to avoid any action which would lead to unnecessary name-changing, recommended the Congress to make an exception in favour of Brisson's generic names and to accord to them availability under the *Règles*, notwithstanding the fact that Brisson had not (as required by the amended text of Proviso (*a*) to Article 25) in the *Ornithologia* applied the principles of binominal nomenclature. Readers who are interested in the detailed terms of the decision taken by the International Commission in this matter are referred to the *Official Record of Proceedings* of the International Commission at the Fourth of its Meetings held during its Paris Session (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 63-66).

5. We see therefore that it was solely for the purpose of promoting stability in ornithological nomenclature and of avoiding unnecessary name-changing that in 1948 the International Commission took the special action described above to provide a legal basis of availability for the generic names published in Brisson's *Ornithologie* of 1760. Neither in this, nor in any other, case, where the International Commission gives a general ruling on the availability of a given book for the purposes of the *Règles*, does the Commission thereby commit itself on the question whether each and every name published in it is free from all objection from the standpoint of stability in zoological nomenclature. For clearly decisions on such questions can only be taken on the basis of detailed information submitted in each individual case concerned. Thus, a decision by the International Commission on the general status of a given book for nomenclatorial purposes in no way fetters the liberty of action of the International Commission in dealing with applications for the use of the plenary powers in relation to individual names first published in the book in question or prejudices the action which at a later date the Commission, on being presented with a statement of the facts, may think it desirable to take for the purpose of furthering stability in nomenclature and preventing confusion.

6. It will be seen therefore that the International Commission is perfectly free to take a decision such as that asked for by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature in relation to the name *Coracia* Brisson, 1760, if it considers such action desirable. It may be added indeed that, at the time when the Commission recommended the Congress to enter Brisson's *Ornithologia* in the Schedule of available zoological works then agreed to be added to the *Règles*, it was aware that applications for the suppression of certain of the generic names published in the *Ornithologie* might later be received, for already the late Dr. James L. Peters (then Vice-President, later President, of the International Commission) had notified the Secretary that it might be necessary for the Commission to consider such action in individual cases.

(b) Need for the decision on the application received from the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature in regard to the names "Pyrrhocorax" Tunstall, 1771, and "Coracia" Brisson, 1760, to cover all aspects of the problem involved

7. Two decisions taken in Paris in 1948 on questions of procedure affect the form and scope of the decision to be taken by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature on the application received from the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature in regard to the names *Pyrrhocorax* Tunstall, 1771, and *Coracia* Brisson, 1760. The first of these decisions, a decision taken by the International Commission itself, is that, contrary to the practice adopted in the case of certain of its earlier *Opinions*, the decision to be taken in any given case is in future to cover all the points involved in the problem in question and not be confined to certain aspects of that problem of special interest to the applicant from whom the case had been received (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 355). The second of the decisions referred to above was that by which the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology laid upon the International Commission the duty of placing upon the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* (or, as the case may be, the corresponding *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names*) the name of any genus, on which a ruling is given by the Commission, and upon the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* (or, as the case may be, the corresponding *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names*) any trivial name in respect of which a decision may be given by the Commission (including the trivial names of the type species of genera, the names of which are placed on the *Official List of Generic Names*, except where any such trivial name is not the oldest available such name for the species in question) (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 267-271, 334).

8. Under the decisions referred to above, the decision to be taken on the present application will need to deal with the following matters :—

(1) Since the application involves the question of the status of the name *Coracias* Linnaeus, 1758 (*Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 107) as the generic name for the Rollers in relation to the name of the objectively identical nominal genus *Galgulus* Brisson, 1760 (*Ornithologie* : **1** : 30 ; **2** : 64) (see Enclosure 2 to application submitted), it will be necessary for this subject to be dealt with in the *Opinion* rendered on this application. Since *Galgulus* Brisson, 1760, is an objective junior synonym of *Coracias* Linnaeus, 1758 (type species, by subsequent selection by Sélby, [1825], *Ill. brit. Orn.* **1** (Landbirds) : xxvii) : *Coracias garrulus* Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 107), no difficulty of any kind arises, all that is necessary being (*a*) that the generic name *Coracias* Linnaeus, 1758 (type species as above) should be placed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, (*b*) that the name *Galgulus* Brisson, 1760, should be placed on the corresponding *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names*, and (*c*) that the trivial name *garrulus* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Coracias garrulus*) should be placed on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names*.

(2) If the International Commission decides to grant the principal part of the request addressed to it and therefore to suppress the name *Coracia* Brisson, 1760 (*Ornithologie* **1** : 30 ; **2** : 3) under its plenary powers, thereby validating the name *Pyrrhocorax* Tunstall, 1771 (*Orn. Brit.* : 2) (type species, by monotypy : *Upupa pyrrhocorax* Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 118), the first of these names will need to be placed on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names*, the second, on the *Official List of Generic Names*. If, however, the Commission were to reject the present application, the name *Pyrrhocorax* Tunstall, 1771, would need to be placed on the *Official Index* and *Coracia* Brisson, 1760, on the *Official List*. In either case, the trivial name *pyrrhocorax* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Upupa pyrrhocorax*) will need to be placed on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology*.

(3) Next, it must be noted that in (for example) Neave's *Nomenclator zoologicus* there is noted a generic name *Pyrrhocorax* Moehring, 1758 (*Geslach. Vogel.* (Nozem. & Vosm. ed.) : 1, 15), which, if an available name, would invalidate the name *Pyrrhocorax* Tunstall, 1771, which would then become a junior homonym. Fortunately, however, in this case also, no difficulty arises, since at its Session held in Paris in 1948 the Commission gave a ruling (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 566-568) that the *Geslachten der Vogelen* (the translation into Dutch of the pre-1758 work published by Moehring in 1752 under the title *Avium Genera*) is not available under the *Règles*, Nozeman and Vosmaer not having (as required by *Opinion* 5) reinforced the names in this book by adoption or acceptance. Accordingly, all that will be necessary in this connection will be that the invalid name *Pyrrhocorax* Moehring, 1758, should be placed on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names*.

(4) It must be noted also that, in addition to the name *Pyrrhocorax* Nozeman & Vosmaer, 1758, discussed above, there is also a name *Pyrrhocorax* Brisson, 1760 (*Ornithologie* **2** : 30-31), of which due account must be taken. In considering this name two points must be noted : (*a*) that within any given assemblage of species treated by him as constituting a " genus," Brisson did not regard himself as in any way bound to cite all the included species under the name of the genus so accepted and indeed very frequently cited the included species under two or more generic (or subgeneric) names, (*b*) where a species had by previous (pre-1758) authors been known by a univerbal specific name and where Brisson adopted for the genus (or the subgenus) concerned the same word as that by which the species in question had previously been known, Brisson, though a " binary " (but not binominal) author, himself cited the species under a scientific name consisting of the single word which thus denoted both the group (? subgenus) to which Brisson considered the species to belong and also the species itself. In the case with which we are here concerned, namely Brisson's " Genus XIV," the genus *Corvus*, Brisson included ten species but of these he cited only one under the

name "Corvus" (here used to denote tautonymy in the manner explained above), the other nine species being cited under the names *Cornix* (4 species), *Pyrrhocorax* (1 species), *Monedula* (4 species). The species to which Brisson applied the generic (or subgeneric) name *Pyrrhocorax* is, according to the synonymy given by Brisson, the "Pyrrhocorax" of Gesner and of Aldrovandus. This species, called by Brisson in French "Le Choucas des Alpes," was stated by him to be somewhat larger than the "Choucas ordinaire" (the jackdaw) and was figured by him as fig. 2 on plate 1 of volume 2 of the *Ornithologie*. Colonel Richard Meinertzhagen, who, at my request, has kindly examined Brisson's description and figure, has informed me (in litt., 13th September 1952) that this bird of Brisson's is the Alpine Chough. If no action were now taken in connection with the name *Pyrrhocorax* Brisson, the suppression (as proposed by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature) of the name *Coracia* Brisson, 1760, would not (as is the purpose of the proposed suppression of this name) validate *Pyrrhocorax* Tunstall, 1771, for the Chough, for that name, though no longer a junior objective synonym of *Coracia* Brisson, would still be an invalid name, as it would remain a junior homonym of *Pyrrhocorax* Brisson, 1760. Accordingly, in order to secure the object sought by the Standing Committee, it would be necessary for the Commission to use its plenary powers not only to suppress *Coracia* Brisson, 1760, but also to suppress the name *Pyrrhocorax* Brisson.

(5) The rule that junior homonyms or junior objective synonyms, when encountered, should be placed on the appropriate *Official Index* will mean that the following names should now be placed on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names* ; (1) *Coracias* Herrmannsen, 1847, *Ind. Gen. Malac.* **1** : 303 ; (2) *Galgulus* Latreille, [1802-1803], (*in* Sonnini's Buffon), *Hist. nat. gén. partic. Crust. Ins.* **3** : 252 ; (3) *Galgulus* Wagler, 1827, *Syst. Avium* **1** : sign. 21 (15) ; (4) *Galgulus* Kittlitz, 1832, *Kupfertaf. Nat. Vögel* (1) : 7 ; (5) *Pyrrhocorax* Vieillot, 1816, *Analyse* : 36.

(6) Finally, it must be recalled that the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology inserted in the provisions relating to the use by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of the plenary powers conferred upon it (now to be incorporated into the *Règles*) an instruction that, where those powers were used to suppress a name for the purpose of validating a name of later date, the suppression so made should be limited to the status of the name in question in relation to the Law of Priority and should not affect its status in relation to the Law of Homonymy (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 339). Under this decision (the purpose of which was to prevent the suppression of a name for the foregoing limited purpose from having the unintended effect of validating some homonym of later date that had previously been rejected or of making it possible to publish for some other taxonomic unit, as a valid name, a name consisting of the same word as that of the name suppressed), the

suppression of the name *Coracia* Brisson, 1760, if decided upon by the International Commission, will necessarily be confined to its status in relation to the Law of Priority, its position in relation to the Law of Homonymy remaining unaffected. Thus, the name *Coracia* Hübner, [1819] (*Verz. bekannt. Schmett.* (11) : 168) will remain an invalid junior homonym of *Coracia* Brisson, 1760, and should accordingly be placed on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names*, together with the later (inadvertently published) name *Coracia* Moerch, 1865 (*J. Conchyliol.* 13 : 385).

8. Having now examined the various subsidiary matters on which action will, under the rules of procedure, be required as part of the decision to be taken on the application regarding the names *Pyrrhocorax* and *Coracia* submitted by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature of the International Ornithological Congress, I summarise as follows, in agreement with Colonel Meinertzhagen, the form and scope of the decision required in the event of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature deciding to approve the application so submitted. In that event, it would be necessary for the International Commission :—

(1) to use its plenary powers to suppress :—
  (*a*) the name *Coracia* Brisson, 1760, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy ;
  (*b*) the name *Pyrrhocorax* Brisson, 1760, for the purposes of both the Law of Priority and the Law of Homonymy ;

(2) to place the under-mentioned generic names on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology :—*
  (*a*) *Coracias* Linnaeus, 1758 (type species, by selection by Selby, [1825] : *Coracias garrulus* Linnaeus, 1758) ;
  (*b*) *Pyrrhocorax* Tunstall, 1771 (type species, by monotypy : *Upupa pyrrhocorax* Linnaeus, 1758) ;

(3) to place the under-mentioned trivial names on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology :—*
  (*a*) *garrulus* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Coracias garrulus*) (trivial name of type species of *Coracias Linnaeus*, 1758)
  (*b*) *pyrrhocorax* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Upupa pyrrhocorax*) (trivial name of type species of *Pyrrhocorax* Tunstall, 1771) ;

(4) to place the under-mentioned generic names on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology :—*
  (*a*) *Coracia* Brisson, 1760 (as proposed, under (1) (*a*) above, to be suppressed under the plenary powers for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy)

(*b*) *Coracia* Hübner, [1819] (a junior homonym of *Coracia* Brisson, 1760)
(*c*) *Coracia* Moerch, 1865 (a junior homonym of *Coracia* Brisson, 1760)
(*d*) *Coracias* Herrmannsen, 1847 (a junior homonym of *Coracias* Linnaeus 1758)
(*e*) *Galgulus* Brisson, 1760 (a junior objective synonym of *Coracias* Linnaeus, 1758)
(*f*) *Galgulus* Latreille, [1802-1803] (a junior homonym of *Galgulus* Brisson, 1760)
(*g*) *Galgulus* Wagler, 1827 (a junior homonym of *Galgulus* Brisson, 1760)
(*h*) *Galgulus* Kittlitz, 1832 (a junior homonym of *Galgulus* Brisson, 1760)
(*i*) *Pyrrhocorax* Nozeman & Vosmaer, (*in* Moehring), 1758 (a name published in a book declared by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to possess no status in zoological nomenclature)
(*j*) *Pyrrhocorax* Brisson, 1760 (as proposed, under (1) (*b*) above, to be suppressed under the plenary powers ;
(*k*) *Pyrrhocorax* Vieillot, 1816 (a junior homonym of *Pyrrhocorax* Tunstall, 1771).

9. Having thus summarised the action required in the event of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature deciding to grant the application submitted by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature, it is necessary to consider also the action which would be required if the Commission were to take a decision in the opposite sense. This may be summarised as follows by reference to the four main Points enumerated in the immediately preceding paragraph :—

(i) Point (1) in paragraph 8 would need to be replaced by a new sentence placing on record the refusal of the International Commission to 1760. use its plenary powers to suppress the generic name *Coracia* Brisson,

(ii) Under Point (2) the name *Coracia* Brisson, 1760, would be placed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* in place of *Pyrrhocorax* Tunstall, 1771. The name *Coracias* Linnaeus, 1758, would still need to be placed on the *Official List*, for it is not a homonym of *Coracia* Brisson, 1760 (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 161-162, where are set out the criteria adopted by the International Congress of Zoology for determining whether any given pair of generic names are homonyms of one another).

(iii) No change would need to be made in Point (3), except that it would be necessary to amend the note to the entry relating to the trivial name *pyrrhocorax* Linnaeus, 1758, by substituting therein the name *Coracia* Brisson, 1760, for the name *Pyrrhocorax* Tunstall, 1771.

(iv) In Point (4) the only changes needed would be the deletion of the name *Coracia* Brisson, 1760 (sub-point (*a*)) and the insertion between the existing subpoints (*h*) and (*i*) of a new point reading : " *Pyrrhocorax* Tunstall, 1771 (a junior objective synonym of *Coracia* Brisson, 1760)."

PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO VALIDATE THE TRIVIAL NAME "PHILOMELOS" BREHM, 1831 (AS PUBLISHED IN THE BINOMINAL COMBINATION "TURDUS PHILOMELOS") AS THE TRIVIAL NAME OF THE SONG THRUSH

Application submitted by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature of the International Ornithological Congress

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)493)

Covering letter dated 19th October, 1950, with enclosure, from Colonel R. Meinertzhagen, Chairman of the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature of the International Ornithological Congress

As Chairman of the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature, I beg to forward to you the following recommendation for favour of decision by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

ENCLOSURE

"Turdus philomelos" versus "Turdus ericetorum"

Turdus philomelos Brehm, 1831 (*Handb. Naturg. Vog. Deutschl.* : 322) ("Germany") is the name which has been used for about forty-five years for the Song Thrush.

Turdus ericetorum Turton, 1807 (*Brit. Faun.* **1** : 35) ("England"), founded on plate 63 of Lewin's *British Birds* (**2** : 68) published in 1796, was adopted without explanation in 1934 (*Ibis* **76** : 635) for the Song Thrush by the Nomenclature Committee of the British Ornithologists' Union, as it antedates *Turdus philomelos* Brehm, 1831.

In 1924 (*Ibis* **66** : 158) the British Committee had rejected Turton's name, as Lewin's figure is not definitely assignable to the Song Thrush and possibly represents an American Thrush. This doubt still remains, especially as Lewin states that his bird is perfectly distinguishable from the Song Thrush, with which he was well acquainted. Lewin also states that his bird "has a short black mark passing through the eye," which is not a character of the Song Thrush.

It is therefore hoped that *Turdus ericetorum* Turton be rejected, in favour of an old-established name *Turdus philomelos* Brehm, as indeterminable.

R. MEINERTZHAGEN : *Chairman of the Standing Committee.*
J. BERLIOZ : *Museum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris.*
E. STRESEMANN : *Zoologisches Museum der Universität, Berlin.*
JOHN T. ZIMMER : *The American Museum of Natural History, New York.*

ON THE PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO SECURE THAT THE TRIVIAL NAME "PHILOMELOS" BREHM, 1831 (AS PUBLISHED IN THE BINOMINAL COMBINATION "TURDUS PHILOMELOS") SHALL BE OLDEST AVAILABLE NAME FOR THE SONG THRUSH

By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)493)

1. The application submitted by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature of the International Ornithological Congress is concerned to secure that the trivial name *philomelos* Brehm, 1831 (as published in the binominal combination *Turdus philomelos*) shall become the undisputed oldest available trivial name for the Song Thrush. For this purpose it will be necessary to remove the competition of the older trivial name *ericetorum* Turton, 1807 (as published in the binominal combination *Turdus ericetorum*), a name which by some specialists has been identified as a senior subjective synonym of the trivial name *philomelos* Brehm, but by others is regarded as a *nomen dubium*.

2. Prior to the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology held in Paris in 1948, the provisions in the *Règles* relating to the method to be followed in determining the identity of the taxonomic species with which any given nominal species should be identified were of the most primitive and inadequate kind, consisting only of Article 31 which laid down the following rule : "La subdivision d'une espèce en deux ou plusieurs autres est soumise aux mêmes règles que la subsdivision d'un genre." Thus, by the objectionable device of legislation by reference the Rules in Article 30, relating to the determination of the type species of a given nominal genus were applied (so far as applicable) to the determination of the type specimen of a nominal species. But the question of the trivial name to be applied to a given taxonomic species may sometimes depend (as in the case now submitted by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature) upon an entirely different question, namely the procedure to be followed when there is a trivial name which all are agreed is applicable to the species in question but there is also an older trivial name which by some authors is regarded as being applicable to that species but by others as referring to some other known species or as being indeterminable. On this subject Article 31 was entirely silent.

3. During the revision of the *Règles* in Paris in 1948 particular attention was given to the need for substituting a clear and comprehensive set of rules in place of the totally inadequate provisions of the existing Article 31. This subject was discussed at length at the Fourth Public Meeting held by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature during its Paris Session, when detailed proposals (subsequently approved by the Congress) were drawn up for an Article to replace the previous Article 31 (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 73-76). These new rules deal specifically with both aspects of the question involved : first the new rules provide expressly for the procedure to be followed in determining the lectotype of any given nominal species (or, in default of an actual lectotype, the single figure, illustration or previously published description cited in the original description of the nominal species concerned, to represent the lectotype of that species); second, the new rules lay it down that " where some but not all specialists claim to be able to recognise the taxonomic species represented by the nominal species in question or where there is disagreement among specialists as to the taxonomic species so to be recognised, the question at issue is to be referred to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for decision."

4. The present application falls to be dealt with under the provision quoted above. Under that provision, it is possible for the International Commission, according to the circumstances of the case, to put a stop to confusion, either (1) by prescribing the taxonomic species to which the disputed trivial name is to be held to be applicable, or (2) by using its plenary powers to suppress the trivial name in question. The second of these courses is that which the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature has asked the International Commission to adopt in the present instance. Accordingly, if the Commission approve the application submitted to it, it will be necessary for the Commission :—

(1) to declare the specific name *Turdus ericetorum* Turton, 1807, to be a *nomen dubium*, and to use its plenary powers to suppress the trivial name *ericetorum* Turton, 1807 (as published in the binominal combination *Turdus ericetorum*) for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy ;

(2) to place the trivial name *philomelos* Brehm, 1831 (as published in the binominal combination *Turdus philomelos*) on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology :*

(3) to place the trivial name *ericetorum* Turton, 1807 (as published in the binominal combination *Turdus ericetorum*), as proposed, under (1) above, to be suppressed under the plenary powers for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy, on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology.*

PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO SUPPRESS THREE COMPLETELY OVERLOOKED TRIVIAL NAMES APPLIED BY LINNAEUS TO NORTH AMERICAN BIRDS IN 1776, TOGETHER WITH AN EQUALLY OVERLOOKED GENERIC NAME PUBLISHED ON THE SAME OCCASION

Application submitted by
Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature of the International Ornithological Congress

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)502)

Covering letter dated 19th October 1950, from Colonel R. Meinertzhagen, Chairman of the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature.

As Chairman of the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature, I have received an application signed by nine American ornithologists asking that the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should permanently suppress three trivial names proposed by Linnaeus for North American birds, the publication of which in 1776 has been brought to light through papers by Mr. W. L. McAtee published in 1949 and 1950 respectively. The three names which form the subject of the foregoing application were published in a hitherto entirely overlooked list entitled " A Catalogue of the Birds, Beasts, Fishes, Insects, Plants, etc., contained in Edwards' Natural History."

The application received in regard to these names is submitted herewith for consideration by the International Commission (Enclosure 1). That application has been considered by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature, the statement prepared by which is now submitted as Enclosure 2.

The three trivial names covered by the present application namely *lutea* Linnaeus, 1776 (as published in the combination *Muscicapa lutea*), *pensylvanica* Linnaeus, 1776 (as published in the combination *Passer pensylvanica*), and *americ.* [sic] Linnaeus, 1776 (as published in the combination *Vermivora americ.* [sic]) have never been used for the species concerned, apart from the occasion on which they were first published. The same is true of the generic name *Vermivora* Linnaeus, 1776, the name used as the generic name for the third of the foregoing species. The introduction at this date of the foregoing names would cause much unnecessary confusion and would serve no useful purpose whatever. It is for this reason that the International Commission is accordingly asked (1) to use its plenary powers to suppress for the purposes, both of the Law of Priority and of the Law of Homonymy (*a*) the generic name *Vermivora* Linnaeus, 1776, and (*b*) the three specific trivial names specified above, (2) to place the foregoing names on the appropriate *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Names*, (3) to place on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* the trivial names currently used for the species concerned, namely: (i) the name *magnolia* Wilson, 1811 (as published in the combination *Sylvia magnolia*), (ii) the name *albicollis* Gmelin, 1789 (as published in the combination *Fringilla albicollis*), (iii) the name *vermivora* Gmelin, 1789 (as published in the combination *Motacilla vermivora*); (4) to place the name *Helmitheros*

Rafinesque, 1815 (gender of generic name : neuter) (type species, by monotypy ; *Motacilla vermivora* Gmelin, 1789) on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*.

ENCLOSURE 1

Application submitted by nine American ornithologists

The International Zoological Congress at Monaco (1913) adopted a special article appended to the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature which gives the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature authority to suspend the rules if their application would result in greater confusion than uniformity. This rule is to be applied specifically in cases where long-forgotten names are unearthed that have priority over well-established names. At the International Ornithological Congress at Uppsala a committee was established at the suggestion of the Secretary of the International Commission, Mr. Francis Hemming, to collaborate with the International Commission with particular reference to the Monaco Resolution. The undersigned submit to this committee the following request for a suspension of the rule of priority in order to preserve three well-known names of North American birds. We ask the committee to endorse our application and to forward it to the International Commission.

2. The work in which the overlooked names occur is a publication by Linnaeus, consisting of a catalogue of the birds and other animals contained in Edwards' *Natural History*, published in 1776. All the details about this publication are presented by Mr. James L. Peters, 1950 (*Auk*. **67** : 375-377). Eighteen new names are proposed in this publication, but many of them are actually only misspellings of established names. In only three cases is the nomenclature of accepted bird names threatened. They are as follows :—

(1) Magnolia Warbler. The species name *magnolia* Wilson, 1811 (*Sylvia magnolia* Wilson, 1811, *Amer. Ornith.* 3 : 63) has been applied to this species for many generations. The name is antedated by *Muscicapa lutea* Linnaeus, 1776 (: 11) in the recently discovered publication.

(2) White-throated Sparrow. This species has been known for more than 150 years under the name *albicollis* Gmelin (*Fringillo albicollis* Gmelin, 1789, *in* Linneaus, *Syst.* Nat. (ed. 13) 1(2) : 96). This name is antedated by *Passer pensylvanica* Linnaeus, 1776 (: 13).

(3) Worm-eating Warbler. This species has been known under the name *vermivora* Gmelin, 1789 (*Motacilla vermivora* Gmelin, 1789, *in* Linnaeus, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 13) 1(2) : 951). for more than 150 years. It is antedated by *Vermivora americ.* Linnaeus, 1776 (: 13).

3. So far as known, none of the three Linnaean names has been cited in the literature between 1776 and 1949 when Mr. McAtee first called attention to this publication. The names had thus been forgotten for a period of 173 years. On the other hand, the names which they would replace are the well-established names of some of our most familiar birds. They have been listed literally in many thousands of publications.

4. This is clearly a case in which strict adherence to priority would result in greater confusion than uniformity. The International Commission is therefore requested to place the Linnaean names *Muscicapa lutea*, *Passer pensylvanica* and *Vermivora americ.* on the list of *nomina rejecta*, and in turn to place the names *Sylvia magnolia* Wilson, 1811, *Fringilla albicollis* Gmelin, 1789, and *Motacilla vermivora* Gmelin, 1789, on the list of *nomina conservanda*.

5. Failure of speedy action on this request would result in grave damage to the prestige of taxonomy.

E. R. BLAKE (*Chicago Natural History Museum, Chicago, Ill.*)
H. G. DEIGNAN (*U.S. National Museum, Washington, D.C.*)
JOHN J. EMLEN, Jr. (*Zoological Laboratory, University of Wisconsin*)
ALDEN H. MILLER (*California*)
FRANK A. PITELKA (*Museum of Vertebrate Zoology, University of California, Berkeley*)
A. L. RAND (*Chicago Natural History Museum, Chicago, Ill.*)
CHARLES H. ROGERS (*Princeton, New Jersey*)
M. A. TRAYLOR, Jr. (*Chicago Natural History Museum, Chicago, Ill.*)
ALBERT WOLFSON (*North Western University, Evanston, Ill.*)

ENCLOSURE 2

Statement prepared by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature

1. The generic name *Vermivora* Linnaeus, 1776, *Cat. Birds, Beasts, Fishes, Insects . . . in Edwards' Natural History* : 13.

   It is recommended that the above name should be made a *nomen rejectum* and that the following name by which the genus concerned is now known should be made a *nomen conservandum* ;—*Helmitheros* Rafinesque, 1819, *J. Physique* **88** : 418 (type species, by monotypy : *Motacilla vermivora* Gmelin, 1789, in Linnaeus, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 13) **1**(2)951).

2. The trivial name comprised in the specific name *Muscicapa lutea* Linnaeus, 1776, *ibid.* : 11.

   It is recommended that the above name be made a *nomen rejectum* and that the trivial name comprised in the name currently accepted for this species, namely *Sylvia magnolia* Wilson, 1811, *Amer. Ornith.* **3** : 63, be made a *nomen conservandum*.

3. The trivial name comprised in the specific name *Passer pensylvanica* Linnaeus, 1776, *ibid.* : 13.

   It is recommended that the above name be made a *nomen rejectum* and that the trivial name comprised in the specific name currently accepted for this species, namely *Fringilla albicollis* Gmelin, 1789, in Linnaeus, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 13) **1**(2) : 96 (" Pennsylvania "), be made a *nomen conservandum*.

4. The trivial name comprised in the specific name *Vermivora americ.* [sic] Linnaeus, 1776, *ibid.* : 13.

   It is recommended that the above name be made a *nomen rejectum* and that the trivial name comprised in the specific name currently accepted for this species, namely *Motacilla vermivora* Gmelin, 1789, *in* Linnaeus, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 13) **1**(2) : 951 (" Pennsylvania "), be made a *nomen conservandum*.

R. MEINERTZHAGEN, *Chairman of the Standing Committee.*
E. STRESEMANN, *Zoologisches Museum der Universität, Berlin.*
JOHN T. ZIMMER, *The American Museum of Natural History, New York.*

ON THE PROPOSAL BY THE NOMENCLATURE COMMITTEE OF THE AMERICAN MUSEUM OF NATURAL HISTORY, NEW YORK, FOR THE SUPPRESSION UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS OF THE LINNEAN NAMES PUBLISHED IN 1776 IN THE "CATALOGUE OF EDWARDS' NATURAL HISTORY" WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE NEW NAMES FOR BIRDS

By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.
(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

(Commission's references Z.N.(S.)502 and 649)

When the International Commission comes to consider the application submitted by the Nomenclature Committee of the American Museum of Natural History, New York, that the plenary powers should be used to suppress all the new names by Linnaeus published in 1776 in the *Catalogue of Edwards' Natural History* (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **6** : 163), it will be necessary to consider two questions which would call for decision if it were proposed to take action in the sense recommended.

2. The points to be considered are :—

(1) If this work were to be suppressed for nomenclatorial purposes, should that suppression be absolute (i.e. should that suppression apply for the purposes both of the Law of Priority and of the Law of Homonymy) or should it be limited, either for all names in the book or for some of them, to the Law of Priority ?

(2) If the whole work were to be suppressed for either or both of the foregoing purposes, what steps ought to be taken to give effect in this case to the general direction of the International Congress of Zoology that adequate measures should be taken to ensure that the decision so taken is clearly related to the individual names involved (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 334).

3. On Point (1) the position is, so far as I know, that in one group only has a detailed survey been made of the new names in this *Catalogue*. The group concerned is the birds, as regards which Dr. James L. Peters (*Museum of Comparative Zoology, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.*) has published (1950, *Auk* **67** : 375-377) a complete list of the names involved. In view of the fact that the names concerned have thus acquired considerable prominence, I suggest that, if the Commission were to use its plenary powers to suppress this work, the logical course, as regards the bird names, would be to suppress them for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy. The effect of such a decision would be to prevent these names or any of them from taking priority over names in current use but at the same time, by maintaining the status of these names for purposes of homonymy, to prevent the confusion which might arise if the same trivial names were later to be applied to other species in the genera concerned. In the case of the groups, other than birds, no publicity in modern times has, so far as I am aware, been given to the names in question ; it would seem appropriate, therefore, that, if the names in this *Catalogue* are to be rejected, the names of taxonomic units belonging to groups other than birds should be suppressed absolutely, that is, both for the purposes of the Law of Priority and also for those of the Law of Homonymy.

4. On Point (2), it would be necessary, if the *Catalogue* were to be suppressed, to ask specialists in the various groups concerned to examine that work and to report which names in it were new and would therefore be affected by the general decision taken. The names so reported would then be placed on the *Official Indexes of Rejected and Invalid Names*. In the case of the bird names in the *Catalogue* the required information is already available through the paper by Dr. Peters referred to in paragraph 3 above, where it is shown that in the *Catalogue* there are one generic name and eighteen trivial names which are either new or have been so changed in spelling as, in Dr. Peters' opinion, to rank as new names. Particulars regarding these names have been extracted from Dr. Peters' paper and are given in the annexes attached hereto.

ANNEXE 1

One new generic name for a bird by Linnaeus published in 1776 in the "Catalogue of Edwards' Natural History"

Vermivora Linnaeus, 1776 (: 13); a name based upon plate 305. This name antedates the name *Vermivora* Swainson, 1827.

ANNEXE 2

New trivial names for birds by Linnaeus published in 1776 in the "Catalogue of Edwards' Natural History"

New Name	Page in "Catalogue" where name given	Plate in Edwards' "Nat. Hist." on which name based	Modern equivalent (as worked out by Dr. James L. Peters)
americ, Vermivora	13	305	*Motacilla vermivora* Gmelin, 1789
araracina, Psittacus	9	159	*Psittacus ararauna* Linnaeus, 1758
bicator, Coracias	13	320	*considered to be unidentifiable*
calidris, Motacitta [sic]	8	121	*species figured not recognisable*
cinereus, Todos [sic]	12	262	*Todus cinereus* Linnaeus, 1766
dominica, Loxia	8	127	*Loxia dominicana* Linnaeus, 1758
falcolinus, Tetrao	11	246	*Tetrao francolinus* Linnaeus, 1766
globifera, Crax	13	295	*Crax globicera* Linnaeus, 1766
hybrida, Meleagris	14	337	*Lyrurus tetrix* x *Phasianus colchicus*
lutea, Muscicapa	11	255	*Sylvia magnolia* Wilson, 1811
nyctelea, Strix	6	61	*Strix nyctea* Linnaeus, 1758 (*Strix scandiaca* Linnaeus, 1758)
pensylvanica [sic], *Passer*	13	304	*Fringilla albicollis* Gmelin, 1789
senegallensis, Picus	9	182	*Picus benghalenis* Linnaeus, 1758
spectrum, Psittacus	13	315	*Psittacus fuscus* Müller (P.L.S.), 1776
spectrum, Psittacus	13	316	*Psittacus aterrimus* Gmelin, 1788
umbellatus, Tetrao	11	248	*Tetrao umbellus* Linnaeus, 1766
voarula, Motacilla	12	259	*Motacilla boarula* Linnaeus, 1771
zeylonicus, Turdus	13	321	*Turdua zeylonus* Linnaeus, 1766

FIRST REPORT ON THE SPECIES WHICH UNDER THE "RÈGLES" ARE THE TYPE SPECIES OF CERTAIN GENERA OF BIRDS DISCUSSED, BUT LEFT UNSETTLED, IN "OPINION" 16

By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.
(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)274

During its Session of Meetings held in Paris in 1948, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature decided, in accordance with its earlier decision that names ought not to be discussed in its *Opinions* without decisions being given in regard to the questions at issue (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 355), that steps should be taken as soon as possible to determine, and to render *Opinions* regarding, the species to be accepted as the type species of a long list of nominal genera enumerated in *Opinion* 16 (1910, *Smithson. Publ.* **1938** : 31-39) as possibly having had their type species determined under Linnean tautonymy (i.e. by the citation of a tautonymous pre-1758 univerbal specific name for one, but not more than one, of the included nominal species), on which however no decision was given in that *Opinion*. The Commission decided (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 580-583) to invite the Secretary to make inquiries in regard to each of the generic names concerned for the purpose of ascertaining the views currently held by specialists on the question whether, as regards each of the genera so named, the generic name was available nomenclatorially, the genus was a taxonomically valid genus, and the species accepted as its type species was the species which, as shown in the second paragraph of *Opinion* 16 (1947, *Opinions and Declarations rendered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* **1** : 259-261), would be the type species if Rule (*d*) in Article 30, as interpreted by *Opinion* 16, were in fact applicable to the name of the genus in question. The Commission agreed further that, where (1) the foregoing inquiry showed that the type species of any one of the nominal genera discussed in *Opinion* 16 was the species there provisionally indicated as such, (2) that the nominal genus in question was currently treated by specialists as being taxonomically valid and as having, as its type species, the species referred to above, the name of that genus should forthwith be placed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, and that in any case where any of the foregoing conditions were not satisfied, the status of the name concerned should be determined separately as soon as possible after the receipt of the Secretary's Report.

2. The present Report is concerned with the names of the twenty-two nominal genera of birds covered by the foregoing decision. In each case I have investigated the position, as disclosed by the current literature, and, in doing so, I have conferred with a number of interested specialists. In order to secure the widest possible publicity for this investigation, I have in addition published a note on the issues to be determined, at the same time appealing to specialists for comments and assistance in regard to the names in question (1952, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **7** : 201-202).

3. As a first step in the present investigation I examined the manner in which each of the nominal genera concerned was treated by Linnaeus in the Tenth Edition of the *Systema Naturae*, for the purpose of determining whether there was a *prima facie* case for considering that the type species of the genus concerned had there been " indicated " by Linnean tautonymy as defined in *Opinion* 16, as further clarified in 1948 by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology on the recommendation of the International Commission (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 155). This investigation showed :—

(1) that there were *prima facie* grounds for considering that the type species of the following eighteen nominal genera had been indicated in 1758 by Linnean tautonymy :—*Caprimulgus* ; *Certhia* ; *Corvus* ; *Cuculus* ; *Fringilla* ; *Fulica* ; *Loxia* ; *Meleagris* ; *Merops* ; *Motacilla* ; *Pavo* ; *Pelecanus* ; *Phasianus* ; *Scolopax* ; *Sterna* ; *Strix* ; *Tringa* ; *Upupa* :

(2) that in the following cases it was a matter for consideration whether a single cautonymous univerbal specific name had been clearly cited in the synonymy of any of the included species : *Otis* ; *Tetrao* ; *Vultur* :

(3) that in the case of the genus *Charadrius* Linnaeus, 1758, the tautonymous univerbal pre-1758 specific name " Charadrius " had been cited in the synonymy of more than one of the included species (being so cited both for *Charadrius hiaticula* and for *Charadrius oedicnemus*) and therefore that the type species of the genus *Charadrius* Linnaeus, 1758, was not " indicated " by Linnean tautonymy.

4. The names cited in paragraph 3(2) and (3) above (i.e. *Otis* Linnaeus, 1758 ; *Tetrao* Linnaeus, 1758 ; *Vultur* Linnaeus, 1758 ; *Charadrius* Linnaeus, 1758) are not dealt with in the present Report, being reserved for later consideration in the light of comments and advice received from specialists.

5. The second step in the inquiry remitted to me was to ascertain whether in each of the eighteen cases specified in paragraph 3(1) above the nominal species which there were *prima facie* grounds for considering as having been " indicated " by Linnaeus in 1758 by Linnean tautonymy as the type species of the genus concerned was currently accepted by specialists as being the type species of the genus in question. This investigation showed that in every case except that of *Strix* Linnaeus, 1758, the nominal species indicated as the type species by Linnean tautonymy was currently accepted as such. The case of *Strix* Linnaeus is accordingly reserved, like that of the names referred to in paragraph 4 above, for further consideration in the light of comments and advice from specialists. In the remaining seventeen cases the generic name concerned is currently accepted by specialists as the name of a taxonomically valid genus. Further, the trivial name of the type species of each of these nominal genera is an available name and is currently accepted by specialists as the name of a taxonomically valid species.

6. Having now completed the first stage of the investigation remitted to me. I submit the following conclusions for consideration :—

(1) The seventeen generic names enumerated in Appendix 1 to the present Report are nomenclatorially available and are currently accepted by specialists as the names of taxonomically valid genera, and the species currently accepted as the type species of each of the nominal genera concerned is the nominal species indicated as such by Linnaeus in 1758 by Linnean tautonymy. Accordingly under the decision taken in 1948 by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 583, Point (3)(*a*)), these names are due now to be placed upon the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology.*

(2) The seventeen specific trivial names enumerated in Appendix 2 to the present Report, being respectively the trivial names of the type species of the nominal genera referred to in (1) above, should, under the regulations governing the admission of names to the *Official Lists* (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** ; 270), be placed on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* at the same time that, under (1) above, the names of the nominal genera, of which the species bearing these trivial names are the respective type species, are placed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology :*

(3) The five remaining generic names remitted to me for investigation (*Charadrius* Linnaeus, 1758 ; *Otis* Linnaeus, 1758 ; *Strix* Linnaeus, 1758 ; *Tetrao* Linnaeus, 1758 ; *Vultur* Linnaeus, 1758) will be dealt with in later Reports on the conclusion of consultations with interested specialists.

FRANCIS HEMMING,
Secretary to the International Commission on
Zoological Nomenclature.

28 Park Village East,
Regent's Park,
London, N.W.1, England.

17*th August* 1952.

APPENDIX 1

Seventeen generic names in the Class Aves discussed but not settled in " Opinion " 16, now proposed to be added to the " Official List of Generic Names in Zoology "

Caprimulgus Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 193 (gender of generic name : masculine) (type species, by Linnean tautonymy : *Caprimulgus europaeus* Linnaeus, 1758, *ibid.* **1** : 193).

Certhia Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 118 (gender of generic name : feminine) (type species, by Linnean tautonymy : *Certhia familiaris* Linneaus, 1758, *ibid.* **1** : 118).

Corvus Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 105 (gender of generic name : masculine) (type species, by Linnean tautonymy : *Corvus corax* Linnaeus, 1758, *ibid.* **1** : 105).

Cuculus Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 110 (gender of generic name : maculine) (type species, by Linnean tautonymy : *Cuculus canorus* Linnaeus, 1758, *ibid.* **1** : 110).

Fringilla Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 179 (gender of generic name : feminine) (type species, by Linnean tautonymy : *Fringilla coelebs* Linnaeus, 1758, *ibid.* **1** : 179).

Fulica Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 152 (gender of generic name : feminine) (type species, by Linnean tautonymy : *Fulica atra* Linnaeus, 1758, *ibid.* **1** : 152).

Loxia Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 171 (gender of generic name : feminine) (type species, by Linnean tautonymy : *Loxia curvirostra* Linnaeus, 1758, *ibid.* **1** : 171).

Meleagris Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 156 (gender of generic name : feminine) (type species, by Linnean tautonymy : *Meleagris gallopavo* Linnaeus, 1758, *ibid.* **1** : 156).

Merops Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 117 (gender of generic name : masculine) (type species, by Linnean tautonymy : *Merops apiaster* Linnaeus, 1758, *ibid.* **1** : 117).

Motacilla Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 184 (gender of generic name : feminine) (type species by Linnean tautonymy : *Motacilla alba* Linnaeus, 1758, *ibid.* **1** : 185).

Pavo Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 156 (gender of generic name : masculine) (type species, by Linnean tautonymy : *Pavo cristatus* Linnaeus, 1758, *ibid.* **1** : 156).

Pelecanus Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 132 (gender of generic name : masculine) (type species, by Linnean tautonymy : *Pelecanus onocrotalus* Linnaeus, 1758, *ibid.* **1** : 132).

Phasianus Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 158 (gender of generic name : masculine) (type species, by Linnean tautonymy : *Phasianus colchicus* Linnaeus, 1758, *ibid.* **1** : 158).

Scolopax Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 145 (gender of generic name : feminine) (type species, by Linnean tautonymy : *Scolopax rusticola* Linnaeus, 1758, *ibid.* **1** : 146).

Sterna Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 137 (gender of generic name : feminine) (type species, by Linnean tautonymy : *Sterna hirundo* Linnaeus, 1758, *ibid.* **1** : 137).

Tringa Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 148 (gender of generic name : feminine) (type species, by Linnean tautonymy : *Tringa ochropus* (emend. of *ocrophus*) Linnaeus, 1758, *ibid.* **1** : 149)*.

Upupa Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 117 (gender of generic name : feminine) (type species, by Linnean tautonymy : *Upupa epops* Linnaeus, 1758, *ibid.* **1** : 117).

APPENDIX 2

Seventeen specific trivial names, being the trivial names of the type species of the nominal genera enumerated in Appendix 1, now proposed to be added to the " Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology "

alba Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 185 (as published in the combination *Motacilla alba*) (trivial name of type species of *Motacilla* Linnaeus, 1758).

apiaster Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 117 (as published in the combination *Merops apiaster*) (trivial name of type species of *Merops* Linnaeus, 1758).

atra Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 152 (as published in the combination *Fulica atra*) (trivial name of type species of *Fulica* Linnaeus, 1758).

canorus Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 110 (as published in the combination *Cuculus canorus*) (trivial name of type species of *Cuculus* Linnaeus, 1758).

coelebs Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 179 (as published in the combination *Fringilla coelebs*) (trivial name of type species of *Fringilla* Linnaeus, 1758).

colchicus Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 158 (as published in the combination *Phasianus colchicus*) (trivial name of type species of *Phasianus* Linnaeus, 1758).

corax Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 105 (as published in the combination *Corvus corax*) (trivial name of type species of *Corvus* Linnaeus, 1758).

---

*For the reason why it is here suggested that the emended form of the trivial name of the type species of this genus should be accepted, see Note to Appendix 2.

cristatus Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 156 (as published in the combination *Pavo cristatus*) (trivial name of type species of *Pavo* Linnaeus, 1758).

curvirostra Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 171 (as published in the combination *Loxia curvirostra*) (trivial name of type species of *Loxia* Linnaeus, 1758).

epops Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 117 (as published in the combination *Upupa epops*) (trivial name of type species of *Upupa* Linnaeus, 1758).

europaeus Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 193 (as published in the combination *Caprimulgus europaeus*) (trivial name of type species of *Caprimulgus* Linnaeus, 1758).

familiaris Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 118 (as published in the combination *Certhia familiaris*) (trivial name of type species of *Certhia* Linnaeus, 1758).

gallopavo Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 156 (as published in the combination *Meleagris gallopavo*) (trivial name of type species of *Meleagris* Linnaeus, 1758).

hirundo Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 137 (as published in the combination *Sterna hirundo*) (trivial name of type species of *Sterna* Linnaeus, 1758).

ochropus (emend. of *ocrophus*) Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 149 (as published in the combination *Tringa ocrophus*) (trivial name of type species of *Tringa* Linnaeus, 1758).

onocrotalus Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 132 (as published in the combination *Pelecanus onocrotalus*) (trivial name of type species of *Pelecanus* Linnaeus, 1758).

rusticola Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 146 (as published in the combination *Scolopax rusticola*) (trivial name of type species of *Scolopax* Linnaeus, 1758).

NOTE.—Attention is drawn to the fact that in the foregoing list the form in which it is suggested that the trivial name of the type species of *Tringa* Linnaeus, 1758, should be added to the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* is " ochropus " and not " ocrophus," the spelling employed by Linnaeus in 1758. Linnaeus evidently had no fixed ideas as to how this word should be spelt, for (as pointed out by Witherby, 1940, *Handbook Brit. Birds* **4** : 310) Linnaeus used the spelling " ocropus " in the Twelfth Edition of the *Syst. Nat.* In 1758 Linnaeus made it clear that, in applying this name to the Green Sandpiper, he was doing no more than copying it from Gesner (510, 511), reference to whose work shows that Linnaeus made an error in copying from Gesner (or the printer misread Linnaeus' manuscript), for the spelling used by Gesner was " ochropus," the currently accepted emendation of the incorrect version " ocrophus " of the 10th edition of the *Systema Naturae.* Since the foregoing conclusion was reached, the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature of the International Ornithological Congress has submitted to the International Commission an application (Z.N.(S.)491) for the emendation under Article 19 of the trivial names of three species of bird, one of which is the name discussed above. (See page 52 of the present volume.)

TYPE SPECIES OF CERTAIN GENERA OF BIRDS, DISCUSSED, BUT LEFT UNSETTLED, IN "OPINION" 16: SUPPORT FOR PROPOSALS SUBMITTED IN THE SECRETARY'S REPORT

By RICHARD MEINERTZHAGEN, D.S.O.
(*London*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)274)

(Letter dated 20th August, 1952)

Thank you for your letter of 18th August enclosing a copy of your Report to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature on the question of the species to be accepted as the type species of the genera of birds which were discussed in the Commission's *Opinion* 16 but on which no decision was then taken.

I am very much in favour of decisions being taken by the Commission in regard to these generic names, for the present position is very unsatisfactory, there being at present no method by which to ascertain with certainty whether the type species of these genera were determined by Linnean tautonymy under the ruling given in *Opinion* 16. I therefore welcome the proposal that the seventeen generic names set out in your Report, where it is clear that the type species of the genera concerned were settled in this way and where the species so indicated are those which are currently as being the type species of the genera in question, should now be placed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*. The position as regards the five other generic names will, as you say, need to be considered further in greater detail.

I see that in the case of the genus *Tringa* Linnaeus, 1758, you propose that the trivial name of the type species should be placed on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* in the form of the long-established emendation "ochropus" in place of the incorrect spelling "ocrophus" used by Linnaeus in 1758. This proposal is certainly right, for any other course would lead to pointless name-changing and would serve no useful purpose. Moreover, as is clear, Linnaeus himself would have used the emended spelling if it had not been for the fact that he made an error of copying when he took this word over from Gesner. As you know, this trivial name is one of the three such names, recognition of the emendations made for which has been asked for in the application Z.N.(S.)491, which the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature has submitted to the International Commission.

PROPOSED ADDITION TO THE "OFFICIAL LIST OF SPECIFIC TRIVIAL NAMES IN ZOOLOGY" OF THE TRIVIAL NAMES OF TWO SIBERIAN BIRDS

By the late JAMES L. PETERS

(*Museum of Comparative Zoology at Harvard College, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)496)

The present application to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is concerned with the question of the trivial names properly applicable to two species of lark, each of which was originally described from Siberian material. The names and relevant synonyms of these species are as follows :—

Species "A"

Alauda yeltonensis Forster, 1767, *Phil. Trans.* **57** (2) : 350.

Tanagra siberica Sparrman, 1786, *Mus. carlson.* (1) : No. xix (et fig.).

Species " B "

Alauda sibirica Gmelin, 1789, *in* Linnaeus, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 13) **1** (2) : 799.

Alauda leucoptera Pallas, 1811, *Zoogr. rosso-asiat.* **1** : 518, pl. 33.

2. The two species are considered to be congeneric, both being referred to the genus *Melanocorypha* Boie, 1828 (*Isis* (Oken) **1828** : 322). For many years the first of these species was known as *Melanocorypha yeltonensis* (Forster) and the second as *Melanocorypha sibirica* (Gmelin). About twenty years ago, however, Hartert & Steinbacher (1932, *Vög. pal. Fauna*, Erganzungsband (1) : 103) discarded the trivial name *sibirica* Gmelin for species " B," on the ground that it was a secondary homonym of the trivial name *siberica* Sparrman, 1786, which, as shown above, is a junior synonym of *yeltonensis* Forster, 1767, the oldest available name for species " A." These authors thereupon applied the trivial name *leucoptera* Pallas, 1811, to species " B." Most recent authors have followed Hartert & Steinbacher in this matter and have used the trivial name *leucoptera* Pallas for species " B."

3. Doubts have been expressed as to the correctness of the action of these authors in rejecting the name *sibirica* Gmelin, having regard to the fact that the spelling of this name is not identical with that of the name (*siberica* Sparrman) for which it was rejected on the ground of secondary homonymy. In this connection it was pointed out, in particular, that the differences in spelling between these two names are not among the differences which the third paragraph of Article 35 prescribes are to be ignored in determining whether any given pair of trivial names are to be treated as being homonyms of one another.

4. If the considerations set forth above alone were relevant to this matter, the argument advanced above would be unanswerable, and there could be no doubt that, under the Rules, the practice of the last twenty years should be reversed and that species " B " should in future be known by the trivial name *sibirica* (Gmelin).

5. The foregoing argument does not however cover the whole of the field in a case of this kind, for it ignores the fact that, where we are concerned with two trivial names, each based upon the name of the same locality and differing from one another only in some small respect of spelling, the difference may be due to an error of orthography or of transcription or to a printers' error and therefore that Article 19 may apply to one of the names in question. In such a case the effect of applying Article 19 may be to make the two names identical with one another and thus to make them homonyms of one another. This clearly was a possibility which it was necessary to examine, for although I should not consider the present case of sufficient importance to justify the use by the Commission of its plenary powers for the sake of preserving the practice which has grown up since the publication of the volume by Hartert & Steinbacher (1932), it is equally important to avoid any action which would disturb that practice unless it was clear that this was necessary under a strict application of the Rules.

6. At this stage therefore I consulted my colleague, Mr. Francis Hemming, Secretary to the Commission, who has furnished to me the following Report (*in litt*, 6th May 1951) :—

> In approaching the question whether trivial names such as *sibirica* and *siberica* should, or should not, be treated as homonyms of one another, one cannot fail to be impressed by the fact that the late Charles D. Sherborn, the most learned bibliographer of his time, treated names spelt "*siberica*" as misspellings for "*sibirica*," listing both together under the latter spelling (1902, *Index Anim.*, Pars prima : 900). Although in the present case there was a strong presumption from the type localities of the two larks in question that the trivial names applied to these species by Sparrman (1786) and Gmelin (1789) respectively were each intended to indicate the same locality and therefore that the difference in spelling between the two names did not indicate a difference in meaning, being a matter of orthography only, it seemed to me, on receiving your inquiry, that the first step to be taken should be to investigate the question of the meaning attaching to these words. I accordingly applied for advice to Professor Charles Singer, Professor Emeritus of the History of Science in the University of London, than whom, in my opinion, no more authoritative adviser could be found on a question of this kind. Professor Singer kindly undertook to consider this question and in due course furnished the following report : "The correct form of the adjective is undoubtedly 'sibir-' not 'siber-.' Sibir was the name of a Tabar fort on the Irtish which was captured by Cossacks in 1581. The name 'Sibiria' was extended in the seventeenth century to the Muscovite dominions in the North-East. Thus, 'sibirica' is the proper adjective."
>
> In view of Professor Singer's Report, it is clear that there was at no time any place named "Siber," as contrasted with the Tabar fort named "Sibir" and that, in view of the extension during the seventeenth century of the meaning attaching to the word "Sibiria" (and thus, to the adjective "sibirica"), it must certainly be concluded that, where (as here) two species occurring in the portion of the Muscovite dominions known, in English, as "Siberia" are named respectively "*sibirica*" and "*siberica*," that difference in spelling is not due to any difference in the origin or meaning of the two trivial names in question but is attributable solely to difference in orthography. In the present case, Professor Singer has shown conclusively that the correct way of spelling the adjective in question is "*sibirica*" and not "*siberica*," thus endorsing the conclusion reached in this matter by Sherborn nearly fifty years ago, a conclusion which, it may be noted, no one in the intervening period has ever tried to dispute.

The problem with which we are confronted here has therefore nothing to do with the question whether these two larks have the same word as their trivial name: it is quite clear that they have. The question to be considered is whether the difference in spelling adopted for these two names is a legitimate difference (in which case the two names would not be homonyms of one another) or, being due to error of spelling in the case of one of the names, is an illegitimate difference and one which calls for action under Article 19. In my view, the information furnished by Professor Singer, taken in conjunction with the considerations advanced above, would make it quite impossible to sustain an argument that there is a legitimate difference between the correctly spelt adjective " sibirica " and the incorrectly spelt adjective " siberica." I conclude, therefore that, under the Rules, it is necessary to emend the defectively spelt trivial name " siberica " under Article 19, to " sibirica " before any consideration is given to the question of the relative status, for the purposes of the Law of Homonymy, of the trivial names published respectively by Sparrman and Gmelin. Once the necessary emendation of Sparrman's faultily spelt trivial name is made, we find that the name so emended is identical with the name later published by Gmelin.

It is evident therefore that Hartert & Steinbacker were perfectly correct when in 1932 they rejected the trivial name *sibirica* Gmelin, 1789, as being, within the genus *Melanocorypha* Boie, a junior secondary homonym of the trivial name *sibirica* (emend. of *siberica*) Sparrman, 1787. A name once validly rejected in this way as a junior secondary homonym cannot, as we know, ever again be used for the species to which it was originally given. Accordingly, ever since the publication in 1932 of Hartert's and Steinbacher's volume, the trivial name *sibirica* Gmelin has been a dead homonym, incapable in any circumstances of being brought back to life again. Since, as those authors pointed out—and as you confirm—the next name to be given to the species to which in 1789 Gmelin gave the invalid name *Alauda sibirica* was the name *Alauda leucoptera* Pallas, 1811, it follows that the oldest available trivial name, and therefore the valid trivial name for the species in question is *leucoptera* Pallas, the name by which that species is currently known.

7. In the circumstances it is clear that it would not be in accordance with the Rules to resuscitate the trivial name *sibirica* Gmelin for the species which for the last twenty years has been known by the trivial name *leucoptera* Pallas. Now that the position in this matter is clearly established, it is desirable that, in order to prevent any subsequent argument on the subject, the oldest available trivial names for each of these larks should be placed on the *Official List*, the invalid trivial name *sibirica* Gmelin being at the same time placed on the *Official Index*. I accordingly ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature :—

(1) to place the under-mentioned trivial names on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* ;—

  (*a*) *yeltonensis* Forster, 1767 (as published in the binominal combination *Alauda yeltonensis*) ;

  (*b*) *leucoptera* Pallas, 1811 (as published in the binominal combination *Alauda leucoptera*) ;

(2) to place the trivial name *sibirica* Gmelin, 1789 (as published in the binominal combination *Alauda sibirica*) (the trivial name of a rejected junior secondary homonym in the genus *Melanocorypha* Boie, 1828) on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology*.

PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO SECURE THAT THE NAME "COLUMBA MIGRATORIA" LINNAEUS, 1766, SHALL BE THE OLDEST AVAILABLE NAME FOR THE PASSENGER PIGEON, THE TYPE SPECIES OF THE GENUS "ECTOPISTES" SWAINSON, 1827

By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.
(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)574)

The subject matter of the present application came to notice in the course of the routine checking of the entries on the *Official Lsit of Generic Names in Zoology* in connection with the projected publication of the *Official List* in book form. It is concerned with the question of the name to be used for the Passenger Pigeon. This species, which is currently known by the name *Columba migratoria* Linnaeus, 1766 (*Syst. Nat.* (ed. 12) **1** (1) : 285) is the type species of the genus *Ectopistes* Swainson, 1827 (*Zool. J.* **3** (11) : 362), by subsequent selection by Swainson in 1837 (*in* Lardner's *Cabinet Cyclop.* **6** : 348—sometimes known by its sub-title *Nat. Hist. Classif. Birds* **2** : 348). The generic name *Ectopistes* Swainson, 1837, was placed on the *Official List* as Name No. 51 in the Commission's *Opinion* 67 (published in 1916, *Smithson Publ.* **2409** : 180).

2. When I checked this entry on the *Official List* against Peters' *Check-List of the Birds of the World*, I found the following footnote on page 83 of volume 3 published in 1937 :—

> There can be no real doubt that Bangs (*Proc. Biol. Soc. Wash*, **19,** 1906, 43–44) was entirely correct in disposing of the Linnean names, *Columba macrours, Columba migratoria* and *Columba marginata*, as he did. On the other hand, his proposed changes have never been accepted, and since there is also room for argument contrary to Bangs' reasoning, I feel that to depart from current usage would only cause needless confusion.

3. It was immediately apparent that, as the name *Ectopistes* Swainson, of which *Columba migratoria* is the type species had been placed on the *Official List*, this matter would need to be resubmitted to the Commission, for it would clearly be improper for the Commission to connive at the ignoring of the problem which had been raised by Bangs (1906, *Proc. biol. Soc. Wash.* **19** : 43–44). As a first step, I consulted Bangs' short paper to ascertain exactly what it was that he had said. His presentation of the issue is very succinct. It reads as follows :—

> THE NAMES OF THE PASSENGER PIGEON AND MOURNING DOVE
>
> To those naturalists who . . . use the twelfth edition of Linnaeus (1766) as the starting point of binomial nomenclature, the names of the Passenger Pigeon and the Mourning Dove are clear and offer no complications. Not so, however, to the Americans and others who start with the tenth edition (1758), for here Linneaus unquestionably included both birds in the references under his *Columba macroura*.
>
> The A.O.U. committee on nomenclature and American ornithologists generally have of late years used this name for the Mourning Dove, and have called the Passenger Pigeon by the name that first appeared in the twelfth edition—*Columba migratoria* Linn. In my opinion, however, this is hardly correct.

Linnaeus' *Columba macroura* was based on Edwards p. 15, t. 15, and Catesby p. 23, t. 23. Edwards' bird, carefully described and well figured, was, of course, a Mourning Dove, but it came from the West Indies, and Edwards tells us, "The Figure of this bird shows it of its natural Bigness." Measuring the various parts and comparing the results with specimens, I find it altogether too small for the continental form of the Mourning Dove, and to agree very well with the small form of Cuba (and other islands of the Greater Antilles ?), which has been lately named *Zenaidura macroura bella* by Palmer and Riley. The reference to Catesby applies wholly to the Passenger Pigeon and the plate shows a fine adult male.

Now as all Linnaeus' references were given chronologically it matters not which came first, and the important question is from which of these two distinct species, confused under one name, did Linnaeus take his brief diagnosis and his " Habitat ". In this instance it is plain. Linnaeus' diagnosis reads " pectore purpurascente ", and he also says " Habitat, in Canada : *hybernat in* Carolina ", both directly from Catesby and neither having anything whatever to do with Edwards.

In the twelfth edition Linnaeus dropped *Columba macroura*, called the Passenger Pigeon *Columba migratoria*, the Carolina Mourning Dove *Columba carolinensis*, and named the bird of Edwards' plate No. 15 *Columba marginata*.

It is therefore my opinion that we who stand by the tenth edition must arrange the names of these Columbae as follows :—

Ectopistes macrourus (Linn.)

Passenger Pigeon

Columba macroura Linn., S.N. ed. 10, p. 164, 1758.

Zenaidura carolinensis carolinensis (Linn.)

Carolina Mourning Dove

Columba carolinensis Linn., S.N. ed. 12, p. 286, 1766.

Zenaidura carolinensis marginata (Linn.)*

West Indian Mourning Dove

Columba marginata Linn., S.N. ed. 12, p. 286, 1766.

4. My next step was to write as follows (on 14th October 1945) to my colleague, Dr. James L. Peters :—

> *Ectopistes* Swainson, 1827 : The type species of this genus is *Columba migratoria* Linnaeus, 1766, that species having been so selected by Swainson in 1837. Inspired by your footnote on page 83 of volume 3 of your *Check-List*, I have read Bangs' note in volume 19 of the *Proc. biol. Soc. Wash.* Naturally, I cannot express any opinion on the validity of his contentions but, as you state that : " There can be no real doubt " that he " was entirely correct in disposing of the Linnean names, *Columba macroura*, *Columba migratoria* and *Columba marginata*, as he did ", I feel that the Commission can no longer leave things as they are, since to do so would be to cite in the *Official List* an incorrectly named species as the type species of the genus *Ectopistes* Swainson, 1827. It seems to me that the only way of avoiding the " needless confusion " referred to in your footnote, while at the same time avoiding an ostrich-like attitude of pretending not to see what

---

*As to this latter name's supplanting *Zenaidura carolinensis bella* (Palmer & Riley) I cannot help feeling regret that a good modern name founded on a bird from a definite region should give way to an old one without definite type locality. But I can see no help for it. Edwards distinctly says his bird was from the West Indies, and figures a very small example, and as the small size of the Cuban Mourning Dove is about its only distinctive character, I am afraid the *Columba marginata* Linn. must be the name by which it shall be known.

> is the matter would be for the Commission to use its plenary powers (1) to declare that *Columba migratoria* Linnaeus, 1766, is the name to be used for the Passenger Pigeon, and (ii) to declare that the name *Columba macroura* Linnaeus, 1758, is the name to be used for the race of the Carolina Mourning Dove from the Greater Antilles. Such action would be in strict accord with Article 3 of the Plenary Powers Resolution (*Declaration* 5), which states that the prevention of the transference from one unit to another of generic and specific names is one of the particular objects of the Congress in granting the Commission these exceptional powers. I shall be grateful for your views on this question, since some action will certainly have to be taken in view of the fact that *Ectopistes* Swainson is on the *Official List*.

5. In his reply (dated 6th December 1945) Dr. Peters wrote as follows :—

> *Ectopistes* Swainson, 1827 : As long as Bangs' suggestion has not been generally accepted, there is no confusion at present concerning the names of the Passenger Pigeon and the Mourning Dove. The suggestion was made 39 years ago and in the passage of time Bangs' proposal has more or less receded into the background and the commonly accepted identity of the two Linnean species involved has become more firmly fixed. There is, however, always the danger that the case will be resurrected and I feel, as you do, that the Commission would de well definitely to use its Plenary Powers and settle the matter for all time.

6. Ever since the correspondence quoted above, I have intended to take the first convenient opportunity for laying the present case before the Commission. Such an opportunity has now arisen through the presentation to the Commission by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature of a large number of applications relating to the names of birds. Before doing so, I have laid the draft of the present paper before Colonel Richard Meinertzhagen, the Chairman of the Standing Committee. Colonel Meinertzhagen has informed me (*in litt.*, 29th August 1952) that he considers that it is important that the Commission should now settle without further delay this long-outstanding question and that he is in agreement with the solution recommended in the present application.

7. Before I set out the action recommended, it will, I think, be repaying briefly to examine what Linnaeus wrote about his nominal species *Columba macroura* when in 1758 (: 164) he first published that name. It is extremely brief and reads as follows :—

Columba

macoura 16. C. cauda cuneiformi longa, pectore purpurascente
Columba macroura. *Edw. av.* 15 *t.* 15.
Palumbus migratorius. *Catesb. car.* 1 *p.* 23 *t.* 23.
Habitat in Canada ; *hybernat in* Carolina.

8. As in many Linnean descriptions there is nothing in the description given by Linnaeus for *Columba macroura* to show, or even to suggest, that he had ever had before him a specimen of the species to which he applied this name or was doing more than giving a name to the birds figured by Edwards and Catesby respectively, which he erroneously supposed were conspecific with one another. Thus, it is quite possible that there never was a type specimen of this nominal species. Whether there was or not, no such specimen is now extant and the only means of identifying the taxonomic species represented by this nominal species is through the two figures which Linnaeus cited. Of these figures, it is agreed by ornithologists that the figure given by Edwards represents the

Mourning Dove and that by Catesby the Passenger Pigeon. Thus, the nominal species *Columba macroura* Linnaeus may be looked upon as having been initially a composite species. According to this view, the trivial name *macroura* Linnaeus would adhere to whichever of the two included species was first definitely so selected under the provisions of Article 31. Until 1948 this Article was so lacking in precision that it is often a matter of opinion whether action by a particular author on a particular date can properly be regarded as a selection made under this Article. In the present instance Bangs quite definitely made such a selection by specifying Catesby's plate 23 as the figure by which the nominal species *Columba macroura* should be identified, thus making Catesby's plate the representative of a lectotype for this species (see 1950, *Bull zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 74–76). This is not to say, however, that no ornithologist at an earlier date had not made a valid selection of Edwards' plate 15 to represent the lectotype, though the fact that no evidence of any such prior selection has, so far as I am aware, been brought forward for the purpose of rebutting Bangs' contention suggests at least that it is unlikely that any such selection is known to have been made. The present case is complicated, however, by the existence of another consideration which does not seem to have been advanced in express terms. This consideration arises from the fact that both the authors (Edwards and Catesby) cited by Linnaeus, though pre-1758 authors, nevertheless by accident applied binominal names to the birds which they figured and that the name used by Edwards was *Columba macroura* and was thus an absolute tautonym of the name selected by Linnaeus for his nominal species. It might therefore be argued that on this account Linnaeus should be treated as having himself "indicated" by absolute tautonymy that he regarded Edwards' bird as being (or his figure as representing) the type specimen of this nominal species, to the exclusion of Catesby's bird, notwithstanding the fact that he took part of his description and the whole of his "Habitat" from Catesby and not from Edwards.

9. It therefore seems legitimate to conclude that in this case (as in the case of the names of many other composite nominal species established long before the introduction of the *Règles*) it is a matter of real difficulty to determine under Article 31 to which of the included taxonomic species the trivial name *macroura* Linnaeus is properly applicable under the *Règles*. Nothing therefore but a ruling by the Commission could provide a definite settlement of the present case. In a case such as the present where on balance it seems likely that the result desired is the reverse of that which would result from a strict application of the ordinary provisions of the *Règles*, the only certain method of securing that solution is by the use by the Commission of its plenary powers. This is the procedure recommended by the late Dr. Peters and is also recommended by Colonel Meineitzhagen. This therefore is the recommendation which I now put forward for consideration.

10. The specific proposals now submitted are that the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should :—

(1) use its plenary powers to designate the description given on page 15, and the figure given on plate 15 by Edwards (G.), *Nat. Hist. Birds*, for the species which that author called *Columba macroura* to represent the lectotype of the nominal species *Columba macroura*

Linnaeus, 1758, the type locality thus to become that cited by Edwards, namely the "West Indies";

(2) place the under-mentioned trivial names on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology*:—

- (*a*) *macroura* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the combination *Columba macroura*), as proposed, under (1) above, to be defined under the plenary powers;
- (*b*) *migratoria* Linnaeus, 1766 (as published in the combination *Columba migratoria*) (trivial name of type species of *Ectopistes* Swainson, 1827);
- (*c*) *carolinensis* Linnaeus, 1766 (as published in the combination *Columba carolinensis*):

(3) place on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* the trivial name *marginata* Linnaeus, 1766 (as published in the combination *Columba marginata*) (a name which, being based upon Edwards' plate 15, is an objective junior synonym of the trivial name *macroura* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the combination *Columba macroura*), as proposed, under (1) above, to be defined under the plenary powers).

PROPOSED CORRECTION IN THE "OFFICIAL LIST OF GENERIC NAMES IN ZOOLOGY" OF INCORRECT DATES AND BIBLIOGRAPHICAL REFERENCES GIVEN FOR THE GENERIC NAME "BALAENICEPS" GOULD, 1850, AND FOR THE NAME OF ITS TYPE SPECIES (CLASS AVES) (CORRECTION OF AN ERROR IN "OPINION" 67)

By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)590)

1. The purpose of the present application is to draw attention to, and to propose the correction of, an erroneous entry in the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* in regard to the dates of publication of, and bibliographical references for, the generic name *Balaeniceps* Gould, 1850, and its type species (Class Aves), made in *Opinion* 67 (1916, *Smithson. Publ.* **2409** : 179). The error in question was detected in the course of routine checking in connection with the preparation of the *Official List* for publication in book form.

2. The generic name *Balaeniceps* and the name of its type species (by monotypy), *Balaeniceps rex*, is commonly treated as having been first published in the volume of the *Proceedings of the Zoological Society of London* for the year 1852. It was on this basis that the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature was asked to place—and did place—the generic name *Balaeniceps* Gould on the *Official List*. The entry in *Opinion* 67 under which this name was placed on the *Official List* reads as follows : " *Balaeniceps* Gould, Proc. Zool. Soc. Lond. 1852, i. Mt., *B. rex* Gould."

3. Before passing to the principal error involved, it must be noted (1)—that the volume of the *Proc. zool. Soc. Lond.* referred to above is numbered " 19 " and should be so cited, (2) that the page on which the name *Balaeniceps* first appeared was numbered " 1 " (as an Arabic numeral) not " i " (small Roman numeral), (3) that volume 19 was published in Parts over a period extending from October, 1852, to June, 1854, and therefore that the date of publication should be cited in square brackets. The correct citation of the foregoing publication of the name with which we are here concerned is therefore : *Balaeniceps* Gould, [1852], *Proc. zool. Soc. Lond.* **19** (1) : 1.

4. But the above is not the first occasion on which the names *Balaeniceps* Gould and *Balaeniceps rex* Gould were published, for as pointed out by Neave (1939, *Nomencl. zool.* **1** : 386) the generic name *Balaeniceps* Gould was first published in 1850 on page 1315 of the volume for that year of the serial publication *Athenaeum*. Reference to the page in the *Athenaeum* quoted shows that on it there is a brief description of Gould's genus *Balaeniceps* and his species *Balaeniceps rex*. Accordingly both these names must in future be treated as having been first published in 1850 and not in 1852 and in the volume of the *Athenaeum* for 1850 and not in volume 19 of the *Proc. zool. Soc. Lond.* The genus *Balaeniceps* Rex, 1850, was monotypical with the above species as type species, just as was also the genus *Balaeniceps* Gould, [1852].

5. It is proposed to incorporate the foregoing correction in the *Official List.*

SUGGESTED REVIEW OF THE ENTRIES ON THE "OFFICIAL LIST OF GENERIC NAMES IN ZOOLOGY" OF THE ENTRIES RELATING TO THE NAMES "OEDICNEMUS" TEMMINCK, 1815, AND "BURHINUS" ILLIGER, 1811 (CLASS AVES)

By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.
(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)591)

In the course of the routine checking of the entries made in the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* undertaken as part of the preparations for the publication of the first instalment of the *Official List* in book-form, I encountered an anomaly in regard to the names of two genera in the Class Aves, which calls for further consideration by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature. The facts of this case are accordingly now laid before the Commission for decision.

2. The names with which the present application is concerned were both placed on the *Official List* in *Opinion* 67 (1916, *Smithson. Publ.* **2409** : 175-182). The names in question are :—

(1) *Burhinus* Illiger, 1811, *Prodr. Syst. Mamm. Avium* : 250 (type species, by monotypy : *Charadrius magnirostris* Latham, 1801, *Index ornith. Suppl.* : lxvi) (Name No. 30)

(2) *Oedicnemus* Temminck, 1815, *Manuel Ornith.* : 321 (type species, by monotypy : *Oedicnemus crepitans* Temminck, 1815, *Manuel Ornith.* : 322 (stated in *Opinion* 67 to be the same species as *Charadrius oedicnemus* Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 151) (Name No. 76).

3. Both the above names are available names in the sense that neither (1) is a junior homonym of an older generic name consisting of the same word nor (2) has, as its type species, a species which is also the type species of another nominal genus of older date.

4. The difficulty which arises in the present case is of a taxonomic character, for, according to Peters (J. L.) (1934, *Check-List Birds World* **2** : 293-297) the taxonomic species represented by the nominal species *Oedicnemus crepitans* Temminck, 1815 (=*Charadrius oedicnemus* Linnaeus, 1758), the type species of *Oedicnemus* Temminck, 1815, is congeneric with the taxonomic species represented by the nominal species *Charadrius magnirostris* Latham, 1801, the type species of the genus *Burhinus* Illiger, 1811. According to this taxonomic view, the nominal genera *Oedicnemus* Temminck, 1815, and *Burhinus* Illiger, 1811, are subjectively identical with one another, and the name *Oedicnemus* Temminck, 1815, is a junior subjective synonym of the name *Burhinus* Illiger, 1811.

5. The purpose of the *Official List* is to give formal official recognition to generic names which are not only nomenclatorially available names but are also, in the opinion of specialists in the group concerned, the names of taxonomically valid genera. It is quite inappropriate that a name that is universally regarded by specialists as a subjective junior synonym of another name should find a place on the *Official List.* Clearly, therefore, any such name which by an oversight has been placed on the *Official List* should be removed therefrom. Accordingly, the name *Oedicnemus* Temminck, 1815, should now be removed from the *Official List*, if ornithologists generally are agreed that the nominal genera *Oedicnemus* Temminck, 1815, and *Burhinus* Illiger, 1811, as defined by their respective type species, are taxonomically identical with one another. If, however, specialists were not agreed on this subject, some recognising the genus *Oedicnemus* Temminck as the name of a taxonomically valid genus in addition to so recognising the name *Burhinus* Illiger, the most suitable solution would be to leave the name *Oedicnemus* Temminck on the *Official List*, but to add to the entry relating to that name a note stating that this name has been placed on the *Official List* for use by specialists who may consider that the type species of this genus is generically distinct from the type species of the genus *Burhinus* Illiger. It will be recalled that a procedure of this kind was deliberately adopted by the International Commission in *Opinion* 104, when dealing with the names of the genera published for the human malaria parasites (the generic name *Laverania* being then placed on the *Official List* with a note of the kind indicated above, in addition to the older name *Plasmodium* Marchiafava & Celli, 1885), and that the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology expressly enjoined the International Commission to follow this course when considering the addition to the *Official List* of names which were available and well known but not accepted by all specialists as being taxonomically required (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 237). It will be appreciated that this procedure serves the twofold purpose of stabilising well-known names, without, in cases where specialists are divided on the question of the taxonomic status of allied nominal genera, involving the International Commission in expressing or implying (through the *Official List*) any view on the taxonomic issue involved.

6. The International Ornithological Congress at its meeting held at Uppsala in 1950 appointed a Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature to co-operate with the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, on questions affecting the names of birds ; it appeared to me, therefore, that it would be helpful to seek the views of the Standing Committee on the question whether the name *Oedicnemus* Temminck, 1815, should be removed from the *Official List* or alternatively whether it should be retained thereon, subject to the addition of a note that this name had been placed on the *List* for use only by authors who considered that the taxonomic species represented by the nominal species *Oedicnemus crepitans* Temminck, 1815, was generically distinct from that represented by *Charadrius magnirostris* Latham, 1801, the type species of *Burhinus* Illiger, 1811. I accordingly asked Colonel Richard Meinertzhagen, Chairman of the Standing Committee, if he would be so good as to obtain the views of his Committee on the relative merits of the alternative courses set out above. Colonel Meinertzhagen kindly consented to put this matter to the Standing Committee and on 2nd September, 1951, wrote me the following letter : " I have consulted the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature on the names *Oedicnemus* and *Burhinus* with reference to the *Official List*. M. Berlioz has not replied, but I am taking a majority vote by which we are agreed that *Oedicnemus* Temminck, 1815, should be sunk to *Burhinus* Illiger, 1811, the respective type species being congeneric."

7. In view of the consensus of opinion regarding the relative status of the two nominal genera concerned and of the recommendation received from the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature, I submit, for consideration, the proposal that the name *Oedicnemus* Temminck, 1815, should now be removed from the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*.

PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO SUPPRESS FOUR GENERIC NAMES FOR BIRDS PUBLISHED BY BRISSON IN 1760 WHICH HAVE LONG BEEN OVERLOOKED AND WHICH INVALIDATE AS HOMONYMS FOUR NAMES PLACED ON THE "OFFICIAL LIST OF GENERIC NAMES IN ZOOLOGY" (CORRECTION OF ERRONEOUS ENTRIES IN "OPINION" 67)

By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.
(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)701)

The purpose of the present application is to ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to use its plenary powers to validate four generic names placed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* by the Commission's *Opinion* 67 (1916, *Smithson. Publ.* **2409** : 177-182), each of which it is now seen is an invalid junior homonym of a generic name consisting of the same word published by M. J. Brisson in 1760 in his *Ornithologie* but since then completely overlooked.

2. The position in regard to this matter is as follows : (1) Brisson was a non-binominal author of what was formerly called the " binary " school, that is, he recognised that the scientific name of an animal must be designed to denote two concepts, namely that represented by the species to which the name was applied and that represented by the next higher group (i.e. the genus) in which that species was placed, and that the generic concept must be denoted by a noun substantive in the nominative singular placed at the beginning of the name, but who did not consider it necessary that the species concept should also be denoted by a single word, regarding it as equally appropriate that this concept should be denoted by a phrase consisting of two or more Latin words. (2) In 1911, at a time when the International Commission considered that generic names published by authors who applied a " binary," though non-binominal system of nomenclature satisfied the requirements of Article 25 of the *Règles*, the Commission published an *Opinion*, *Opinion* 37 (1911, *Smithson. Publ.* **2013** : 87-88), in which it ruled that the generic names in Brisson's *Ornithologie* satisfied the requirements of the Rules. (3) In 1948 (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 65) the International Congress of Zoology substituted the word " binominal " for the word " binary " in Article 25, thereby making it clear that names published by non-binominal " binary " authors possessed no availability in nomenclature. (4) The foregoing decision would have destroyed the availability of all the generic names in Brisson's *Ornithologie*, if it had not been decided to accompany it with a further provision expressly preserving the status previously accorded to those names under its *Opinion* 37 of 1911 (1950, *ibid.* **4** : 65, Point (3) (*a*) (iv)). It will be seen from the foregoing particulars that, other things being equal, every new generic name in Brisson's *Ornithologie* of 1760 is an available name.

3. The recent discovery that Brisson had published a generic name *Gavia* in the *Ornithologie* (see application Z.N.(S.)78, relating to the name *Colymbus*

Linnaeus, 1758*) which had been completely overlooked in all zoological Nomenclators led me to think that it was desirable to make a thorough examination of Brisson's *Ornithologie*, in order to make sure that none of the generic names for birds which had been placed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* was preoccupied by generic names consisting of identical words published in 1760 in Brisson's *Ornithologie* but since overlooked. I have accordingly examined the *Ornithologie* from this point of view, as the result of which it now appears that six generic names now on the *Official List* are invalid (because junior) homonyms of names published by Brisson in 1760. Of the names so found to be invalid, the following five were placed on the *Official List* in *Opinion* 67 : (1) *Bubo* Duméril, 1806 ; (2) *Coturnix* Bonnaterre, 1790 ; (3) *Egretta* Forster, 1817 ; (4) *Gallinago* Koch, 1816 ; (5) *Oriolus* Linnaeus, 1766. The sixth name on the *Official List* now found to be preoccupied by an identical Brisson name is *Grus* Pallas, 1767, which was placed on the *Official List* by *Opinion* 103 (*Smithson. misc. Coll.* **73** (No. 5) : 21-24). Special problems arise in connection with two of these names, namely *Gallinago* Koch and *Grus* Pallas. The first of these cases is dealt with in Application Z.N.(S.) 575 (see pp. 93-95 of the present volume) ; the second in Application Z.N.(S.) 558, which is at present still under discussion with specialists but which will be published as soon as possible. The present application is accordingly concerned only with the position of the names *Bubo* Duméril, *Coturnix* Bonnaterre, *Egretta* Forster, and *Oriolus* Linnaeus.

4. The decision to validate the names in Brisson's *Ornithologie* was taken with the sole purpose of promoting stability in ornithological nomenclature and it would certainly not have been taken in the form then adopted if it had been made clear to the Commission by ornithologists that certain only of the new generic names published by Brisson in 1760 were in general use and required protection, while others had long been ignored and, if validated, would cause disturbance and confusion rather than contribute to uniformity and stability. Now that the actual position has been brought to light, it seems to me that the most reasonable course would be for the Commission so to use its plenary powers as to secure its original intention. In other words, the most appropriate course seems to be to suppress those of the Brisson names which were—as it were, inadvertently—validated when the ruling of 1911 (in *Opinion* 37) was confirmed by the Commission in 1948 in those cases where the names, so validated, would, it is now seen, merely lead to confusion and objectionable name-changing. The number of new names which will need to be examined for this purpose is large, and in view of the consultations with specialists which will need to be undertaken, the investigation involved will necessarily occupy a considerable time. It is for this reason that the four names dealt with in the present application have been picked out for advance consideration, since, until decisions have been taken in regard to these names, the publication of the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* in book form will inevitably be held up.

5. I have consulted Colonel Richard Meinertzhagen, Chairman of the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature appointed in 1950 by the International Ornithological Congress (see pp. 4-5 of the present volume), and he has sent me the following reply (*in litt.*, dated 10th September 1952): " Many of the generic names published by Brisson in 1760 in his *Ornithologie* are household words and it was therefore of the utmost importance that the Commission should provide a valid basis for these names. The action taken by the Commission in this sense in 1948 was therefore of the greatest value. In addition, however, to these names, there are many other new generic names in the *Ornithologie* which have been completely overlooked and which, if now resurrected, would lead to confusion and name-changing, without providing any compensating advantage. This risk will remain until all the new names in the *Ornithologie* have been carefully examined and those names which are in general use finally stabilised by being put on the *Official List*, all the other names concerned being at the same time suppressed. This task, which will be a big piece of work and will involve extensive consultations, will inevitably take a considerable time even in the most favourable circumstances. Pending the completion of this survey, all that the Commission can do is to take such action in individual cases as may be found to be necessary, for example, to suppress the name *Gavia* Brisson, as proposed in the application regarding the name *Colymbus* Linnaeus submitted by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature. In the case of the four names (*Bubo, Coturnix, Egretta* and *Oriolus*) placed on the *Official List* by *Opinion* 67 but now found to be invalid, I consider that is important that the position should be cleared up as quickly as possible by the suppression by the Commission of the four corresponding Brisson names which, though not in current use, technically invalidate these well-known generic names."

---

*See page 11 of the present volume.

6. In the circumstances and in view of the advice received from Colonel Meinertzhagen, I now recommend that the Commission should validate the existing entries in the *Official List* by suppressing the Brisson names which invalidate the four names in question. It would be convenient if at the same time the Commission were to place on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names* one still earlier name consisting of the same word published in 1758 in Nozeman and Vosmaer's *Geslachten der Vogelen* (a Dutch translation of the work by Moehring entitled *Avium Genera* published—before the starting point of zoological nomenclature—in 1752), a work which the Commission has already ruled is unavailable for nomenclatorial purposes (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 566-568).

7. The specific action which the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is now asked to take is therefore that it should :—

(1) use its plenary powers to suppress the under-mentioned generic names for the purposes both of the Law of Priority and of the Law of Homonymy :—

(*a*) *Bubo* Brisson, 1760, *Ornithologie* **1** : 477-486 ;

(*b*) *Coturnix* Brisson, 1760, *ibid.* **1** : 247-261 ;

(*c*) *Egretta* Brisson, 1760, *ibid.* **5** : 431-433 ;

(*d*) *Oriolus* Brisson, 1760, *ibid.* **2** : 320-333 ;

(2) confirm in their position on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* the following names placed thereon by *Opinion* 67 :—

- (*a*) *Bubo* Duméril, 1806 ;
- (*b*) *Coturnix* Bonnaterre, 1790 ;
- (*c*) *Egretta* Forster, 1817 ;
- (*d*) *Oriolus* Linnaeus, 1766 ;

(3) place the under-mentioned generic names on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* :—

- (*a*) the four generic names specified in (1) above, as there proposed to be suppressed under the plenary powers ;
- (*b*) *Bubo* Rambur, 1842 (Roret's *Suite à Buffon*), Nevropteres : 353 ;
- (*c*) *Coturnix* Nozeman & Vosmaer, 1858, *Geslacht. Vogel.* (Dutch trans. of Moehring, 1758, *Avium Genera*) **3** : 39 (a work which has already been ruled unavailable for nomenclatorial purposes).

PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO SUPPRESS THE NAME " GALLINAGO " BRISSON, 1760 (CLASS AVES), AND PROPOSED SUBSTITUTION OF " CAPELLA " FRENZEL, 1801, FOR " GALLINAGO" KOCH, 1816, ON THE " OFFICIAL LIST OF GENERIC NAMES IN ZOOLOGY " (PROPOSED CORRECTION OF AN ERRONEOUS ENTRY IN " OPINION " 67)

By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)575)

The subject matter of the present application came to notice in the course of the checking of the entries on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* in connection with the projected publication of the *Official List* in book form and is concerned with the generic name *Gallinago* Koch, 1816 (*Syst. baier. Zool.* **1** : 312) which was placed on the *Official List* in *Opinion* 67 published in 1916 (*Smithson Publ.* **2409** : 180).

2. The generic name *Gallinago* Koch, 1816, was stated in *Opinion* 67 to have as its type species, *Scolopax gallinoga* Linnaeus, 1758 (*Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 147) by absolute tautonymy, through the " *media* of Koch " (i.e. *Gallinago media* Koch, 1816, *loc. cit.* **1** : 314). This name was therefore a generic name applied to the Common Snipe.

3. When checking this part of *Opinion* 67, I observed that Hartert, after using the generic name *Gallinago* Koch for the Snipe in the main portion of his work relating to the genus concerned (Hartert, 1916, *Vögel paläarkt. Fauna* (2) : 1655), had later in the same work (1921, *ibid.* (3) : 2213) published a correction, pointing out that *Gallinago* Koch was a junior synonym of *Capella* Frenzel, 1801 (*Beschr. Vögel Wittenberg* : 58), the type species of which was the nominal species *Capella coelestis* Frenzel, 1801 (*ibid.* : 58), a nominal species which represented the same taxonomic species as did the nominal species *Scolopax gallinago* Linnaeus. I noted also that my colleague Commissioner James L. Peters (1934, *Check List Birds World* **2** : 274) accepted the name *Capella* Frenzel, sinking *Gallinago* Koch as a synonym.

4. As it was clearly not possible in these circumstances to leave the name *Gallinago* Koch on the *Official List* without prior resubmission to the International Commission, I wrote a letter (on 14th October 1945) to Dr. Peters asking for his views as to the action which it was desirable should be taken. Dr. Peters in his reply (of 6th December 1945) wrote :—"After *Capella* Frenzel was shown to be an earlier name than *Gallinago* Koch and of equal applicability, it was immediately adopted and is now in current use for the different species of Snipe. For this reason I believe the *Gallinago* should be expunged from the *Official List* and *Capella* substituted in its place. No useful purpose would be served by reinstating *Gallinago* Koch under suspension of the rules and suppressing *Capella.*"

5. Quite recently I was led, for the reasons which I have explained in Application Z.N.(S.)701 (relating to the generic names *Bubo*, *Coturnix*, *Egretta*, and *Oriolus*)* to examine carefully M. J. Brisson's *Ornithologie* published in 1760, for I had already discovered that one name (*Egretta* Forster, 1817) that was already on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* was an invalid junior homonym of a totally overlooked name published in Brisson's *Ornithologie.* This search brought to light the existence of the name *Gallinago* Brisson, 1760 (*Ornithologie* **5** : 298-310), which thus greatly antedates the name *Capella* Frenzel, 1801. The name *Gallinago* was used by Brisson as the name for a subdivision of the genus *Scolopax* ; he placed in it all except the first of the five species which he referred to *Scolopax.* All the species described in the *Ornithologie* are described initially under a French name, followed by a Latin diagnosis, at the end of which is given, in different type, the Latin name accepted by Brisson for the species in question, this in turn being followed, in the case of previously described species, by a detailed synonymy. The first of the species placed by Brisson in his *Gallinago* was cited under the French name " La Beccassine," the scientific name at the end of the Latin diagnosis being given simply as " Gallinago " (not because Brisson was a mononominalist, but because he customarily cited in this way the names of species when the " species" portion of the name consisted of the same word (i.e. was a single word) tautonymous with the generic name). In the synonymy of this species Brisson quoted the diagnosis given by Linnaeus in 1758 for his *Scolopax gallinago*, finishing this quotation as follows :—" Gallinago. *Linn. Syst. Nat.* ed. 10 *Gen.* 77 *sp.* 11 " (*Scolopax* being the 77th genus of birds in the 10th edition of the *Syst. Nat.* and *Scolopax gallinago* being the eleventh of the species referred by Linnaeus to this genus). Thus, we see clearly that this species is *Scolopax gallinago* Linnaeus, 1758 (: 147) and that, as its trivial name is tautonymous with the generic name selected by Brisson, it is the type species of *Gallinago* Brisson by absolute tautonymy. Accordingly, the name *Gallinago* Brisson, 1760, is not only a senior homonym of *Gallinago* Koch, 1816, but in addition is a senior synonym of Koch's generic name, Brisson's and Koch's nominal genera each having the same nominal species as its type species. The position so established created a new situation and one under which the entry on the *Official List* relating to *Gallinago* Koch was not only (as previously) subjectively defective (because of the subjective identification of the nominal species which are respectively the type species of *Capella* Frenzel, 1801, and of *Gallinago* Koch, 1816), but also objectively incorrect (through *Gallinago* Koch, being both an objective junior homonym, and an objective junior synonym, of *Gallinago* Brisson, 1760). Faced with this situation, it seemed to me that, since (as Dr. Peters had explained) the name *Capella* Frenzel had by now completely replaced the name *Gallinago* Koch, it would be confusing if now that transition had to be reversed, the name *Capella* Frenzel being displaced by *Gallinago* Brisson.

6. At this stage I consulted Colonel Richard Meinertzhagen, Chairman of the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature who in his reply (dated 12th September 1952) wrote as follows : " If, as at first appeared, the question to be considered in the case of the name *Gallinago* had been whether the name *Gallinago* Koch, 1816, should be replaced on the *Official List* by its senior subjective synonym *Capella* Frenzel, 1801, I should have been strongly in favour of that course, for now that *Gallinago* Koch has been completely replaced by the name *Capella* Frenzel, I should have thought it most unfortunate if, through *Gallinago* Koch being already on the *Official List*, it had been necessary to abandon current practice by reverting to the use of the name *Gallinago* Koch. Now that it appears that the oldest generic name for the Common Snipe is *Gallinago* Brisson, 1760, I hold the same view for the same reason. I accordingly consider that the best course will be for the International Commission to suppress Brisson's *Gallinago*, to remove Koch's *Gallinago* from the *Official List* and to insert in its place the name *Capella* Frenzel. The trivial name *gallinago* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the combination *Scolopax gallinago*) should, I agree, now be placed on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names*. Naturally, however, the trivial name *coelestis* Frenzel, 1801 (the trivial name of the type species of *Capella* Frenzel) ought not to be placed on that *Official List*, for, although nomenclatorially it is an available name, it is only a junior synonym of *gallinago* Linnaeus and therefore can never be needed."

---

*See pp. 82–92 of the present volume.

7. A settlement of this case is urgently required, for at present the problem presented by the name *Gallinago* Koch represents one of the obstacles which is holding up the publication of the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* in book form. In view of the advice received in this case—as set out in paragraphs 4 and 6 above—I recommend that the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should :—

(1) use its plenary powers to suppress the generic name *Gallinago* Brisson, 1760, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy ;

(2) delete the name *Gallinago* Koch, 1816, from the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, at the same time correcting *Opinion* 67 to the extent necessary ;

(3) substitute on the foregoing *Official List* the name *Capella* Frenzel, 1801 (type species, by monotypy : *Capella coelestis* Frenzel, 1801) for the name proposed, under (2) above, to be removed therefrom ;

(4) place the trivial name *gallinago* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the combination *Scolopax gallinago*) on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* ;

(5) place the under-mentioned names on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* :—

(*a*) *Gallinago* Brisson, 1760, as proposed, under (1) above, to be suppressed under the plenary powers ;

(*b*) *Gallinago* Koch, 1816 (junior homonym, of *Gallinago* Brisson, 1760) ;

(*c*) *Capella* Keyserling & Blasius, 1840, *Wirbelth. Europas* **1** : 9 (junior homonym of *Capella* Frenzel, 1801).

PROPOSED ADDITION TO THE "OFFICIAL LIST OF SPECIFIC TRIVIAL NAMES IN ZOOLOGY" OF THE TRIVIAL NAME "SYRIACUS" ROTHSCHILD, 1910 (AS PUBLISHED IN THE COMBINATION "STRUTHIO CAMELUS SYRIACUS"), THE TRIVIAL NAME OF THE SYRIAN OSTRICH (CLASS AVES)

By R. MEINERTZHAGEN, D.S.O. (*London*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)633)

The object of the present application is to ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to place on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* the trivial name *syriacus* Rothschild, 1910 (as published in the combination *Struthio camelus syriacus*), the trivial name of the Syrian Ostrich.

2. The relevant facts in regard to this case are as follows :—

(1) The Ostrich was named *Struthio camelus* by Linnaeus in 1758 (*Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 587). Linnaeus gave "Syria, Arabia, Libya and Africa" as the localities for this bird. In addition, he gave bibliographical references to Aldrovandus, Dodart, Seba, Willughby and Albin. The localities given for the Ostrich by the authorities cited by Linnaeus were : (1) Syria, Sind, Arabia, Libya and Arguin Island, Mauretania (Aldrovandus, through older authors cited) ; (2) Cape of Good Hope (Seba) ; (3) Africa and Arabia (Willughby) ; (4) Deserts of Arabia and Africa (Albin). No locality was specified by Dodart.

(2) It is clear from the particulars given above that, from the point of view of the particulars given in 1758, the nominal species *Struthio camelus* comprised what are now regarded as several distinct subspecies of the Ostrich.

(3) In 1910 the late Lord Rothschild (*Bull. brit. ornith. Club* **39** : 83) gave "North Africa" as the type locality for nominotypical *Struthio camelus camelus* and published the name *Struthio camelus syriacus* for the Syrian Ostrich, which has accordingly been known by that name for the last thirty-two years.

(4) Quite recently (1951, *Bull. brit. ornith. Club* **71** : 45-46) Grant and Mackworth-Praed have advanced the view that "Syria," as being the first of the localities cited by Linnaeus must be regarded as the type locality of nominotypical *Struthio camelus* Linnaeus, 1758 ; they accordingly sink the trivial name *syriacus* Rothschild, 1910, as an objective synonym of nominotypical *camelus* Linnaeus, and, having thus left the North African Ostrich without an available name, give it the name *Struthio camelus rothschildi* "new race." The type locality is given as "Marandet, south Air or Azibine, Niger district, French West Africa." The holotype is an adult male in the collection of the British Museum (Natural History).

3. Captain Grant and Mr. Mackworth-Praed kindly showed me their note before it was published. I then took strong exception to the action proposed, for, in my view, if an author, when naming a new species, cites several localities, subsequent authors are free to select any of those localities as the type locality of the nominotypical subspecies, provided that the original author did not specify a type specimen. Moreover, I consider it the duty of systematists to retain names (such as *syriacus* Rothschild) which have been in use for a generation or more, if this can possibly be done. In this particular case it could not even be urged that the abandonment of the name *syriacus* Rothschild and the renaming of the North African Ostrich was required under a strict application of the *Règles*, for there is no provision in the *Règles* regulating the selection of a type locality from among a series of localities cited in the original description of a species. The action described above is therefore peculiarly unjustified and, if not quashed, will inevitably lead to confusion. At the same time that Grant and Praed's paper was published, I published a short note (*ibid.* **71** : 46), protesting against their action in rejecting the name *syriacus* Rothschild for the Syrian Ostrich. I was very glad to see that in a paper published this year (*Auk.* **69** : 343) the late Dr. James L. Peters supported my protest, writing: Meinertzhagen " objects (and quite rightly) to the action of Grant and Mackworth-Praed in rejecting *S. c. syriacus*."

4. It is a serious weakness in the *Règles* that they contain no provision for regulating the selection of type localities and thus for preventing confusion of the kind described above from arising. It is very much to be hoped that this omission will be repaired by the Copenhagen Congress in 1953 when it resumes the discussions begun in Paris in 1948 for securing greater stability in zoological nomenclature. In the meantime effective action can be taken only by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and it is for this reason that I am submitting the present application.

5. My general purpose is to secure a ruling in favour of the maintenance of the name *syriacus* Rothschild for the Syrian Ostrich and of the name *camelus* Linnaeus for the North African Ostrich. It would be desirable that the same opportunity should be taken for granting formal recognition of the selection of " Sennar " as the type locality of nominotypical *camelus* made by Stresemann in 1926 (*Orn. Monatsber.* **1926** : 139).

6. The proposal which I accordingly submit to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is that it should :—

place the under-mentioned trivial names on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* :—

- (i) *syriacus* Rothschild, 1910 (as published in the combination *Struthio camelus syriacus*), with type locality " Syrian desert " as designated by Rothschild ;
- (ii) *camelus* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the combination *Struthio camelus*), with type locality " Sennar ", as selected by Stresemann in 1926).

PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO SUPPRESS THE NAME " TYRANNULA " SWAINSON, 1827, AND TO DESIGNATE A TYPE SPECIES FOR " MYIOBIUS " DARWIN, 1839 (CLASS AVES)

By JOHN T. ZIMMER

(*The American Museum of Natural History, New York*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)676)

The object of the present application is to ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to use its plenary powers to vary the normal operation of the Rules for the purpose of preventing the confusion and disturbance in long established nomenclatural practice if those rules were to be applied strictly to the names *Tyrannula* Swainson, 1827, and *Myiobius* Darwin, 1839 (Class Aves).

2. The relevant facts concerning the foregoing names are as follows. Darwin published the name *Myiobius* (July 1839, *Zool. Voy.* " *Beagle* " **3**(9) : 46) to replace the name *Tyrannula* Swainson, 1827, which he regarded as an invalid junior homonym of *Tyrannulus* Vieillot, 1816 (*Analyse* : 31). Darwin did not designate a type species for *Myiobius*, but in 1840 Gray (G. R.) (*List Gen. Birds* : 30) selected *Muscicapa* " *barbatus* " Gmelin (i.e. *Muscicapa barbata* Gmelin, 1788, *in* Linnaeus, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 13) **1** : 933) as the type species of this genus. At the same time Gray, following Darwin, placed *Tyrannula* Swainson in the synonymy both of *Myiobius* Darwin and of *Pyrocephalus* Gould, [1839].

3. The foregoing arrangement has been followed by subsequent workers with little disagreement, and *Myiobius* has been current for over a century. One of the decisions taken by the International Congress of Zoology (on the recommendation of the Commission) at Paris in 1948, though, in itself, quite acceptable, has, however, introduced a complication in the present case, which, if not remedied in the manner now suggested, would have objectionable results. The decision in question was that under which a generic name published before 1st January, 1931, is to be accepted as having been published with an indication, if the names of previously established species are cited under the new generic name, even if no description of any kind was given for the new genus (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 80).

4. The generic name *Tyrannula* was first published by Swainson with a formal description in a paper published in December 1827 (*Zool. J.* **3** : 358). Among the species referred to *Tyrannula* in this paper was *Muscicapa barbata* Gmelin, which (as already noted) Gray later selected as the type species of the substitute genus *Myiobius* Darwin, thereby establishing it also as the type species of *Tyrannula* Swainson, if the paper of December 1827 had been the first valid publication of that name. Unfortunately, however, the December paper was preceded by another published in May 1827 (*Phil. Mag.* (n.s.) **1**(5)

367-368). (One aspect of the problem raised by the May paper was dealt with by the Commission in its *Opinion* 30, published in 1911 (*Smithson. Publ.* **2013** : 69-72).) In this paper Swainson used the name *Tyrannula* for eight species but did not provide a generic description. Of the eight species then referred to *Tyrannula*, five were then described for the first time, two were cited from Gmelin, and one was described but tentatively identified with one of Vieillot's earlier described species. Under the new ruling referred to above, the name *Tyrannula* Swainson of May 1827 is an available name, since its components were specified by the original author. The species *Muscicapa barbata* Gmelin was not among the species placed by Swainson in the genus *Tyrannula* in May 1827 and it cannot therefore be accepted as the type species of this genus. No other species has however been suggested to fill that role.

5. Contrary to the view held by Darwin and later by Gray, the name *Tyrannula* Swainson is not a homonym of *Tyrannulus* Vieillot and is, in fact, an available name. Under normal procedures, its type species must be one or other of the eight species cited by Swainson in his paper of May 1827. This would however involve three highly undesirable elements. First, although the exact specific identity of two of these species is uncertain, it seems probable that they, like the other six, belong to one or other of the genera now known as *Myiarchus*, *Contopus*, *Empidonax*, *Myiozetetes*, and *Pyrocephalus*. All these genera were established after 1827, and the selection as the type species of *Tyrannula* of any of the eight species referred to that genus by Swainson in May 1827 would therefore necessitate the replacement of one of these long-established names. Second, the selection of any of these species as the type species of *Tyrannula* would involve the proposal of a new name for the century-old genus *Myiobius* Darwin. Third, confusion would be bound to arise if the names *Tyrannula* Swainson and *Tyrannulus* Vieillot were both valid names for genera in the same family.

6. The name *Myiobius* Darwin was unquestionably proposed as a substitute name for *Tyrannula* Swainson (though of what date is uncertain) and it would be undesirable to disregard the method by which it was proposed, more especially in view of the fact that Darwin did not cite *Muscicapa barbata* Gmelin under his *Myiobius*, and, in consequence, Gray's selection of that species as the type species of this genus would in that event be unacceptable. Moreover, none of the species which were cited by Darwin under *Myiobius* is now considered to belong to this genus. The six species in question are now distributed among five genera, of which only one (*Elaenia* Sundevall [1836]) is older than *Myiobius* but more recent than *Tyrannula*. There is moreover nothing in Darwin's account to suggest that he and Gould considered the proposed *Myiobius* as having special application to *barbata* Gmelin, except through *Tyrannula* Swainson.

7. Since the strict application of the normal rules in the Code would involve several changes in old, established generic names and would leave in the same family two generic names differing only in endings of gender, I believe that this is a case where the International Commission should use its plenary powers to set aside the ordinary rules and maintain the existing accepted nomenclature in this group.

8. I accordingly recommend the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature :—

(1) to use its plenary powers :—

(*a*) to suppress the generic name *Tyrannula* Swainson, May 1827, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy ;

(*b*) to set aside all selections of type species made prior to the decision now proposed to be taken for the genus *Myiobius* Darwin, 1839, and, having done so, to designate *Muscicapa barbata* Gmelin, 1788, to be the type species of the foregoing genus ;

(2) to place the name *Myiobius* Darwin, 1839 (type species, by designation under the plenary powers, as proposed in (1)(*b*) above : *Muscicapa barbata* Gmelin, 1788) on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* ;

(3) to place the name *Tyrannula* Swainson, May 1827, as proposed, under (1)(*a*) above, to be suppressed under the plenary powers, on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* ;

(4) to place the trivial name *barbata* Gmelin, 1788 (as published in the binominal combination *Muscicapa barbata*) on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology.*

SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSAL FOR THE USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO SUPPRESS THE GENERIC NAME "TYRANNULA" SWAINSON, 1827 (CLASS AVES)

By the

STANDING COMMITTEE ON ORNITHOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE OF THE INTERNATIONAL ORNITHOLOGICAL CONGRESS

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)676)

(Letter, dated 22nd July 1952, from Colonel Richard Meinertzhagen, Chairman of the Standing Committee)

The Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature appointed by the International Ornithological Congress has had under consideration an application submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature by Dr. John T. Zimmer in which the Commission is asked to use its plenary powers for the purpose of securing the continued availability of the generic name *Myiobius* Darwin, 1839.

The Standing Committee are of the opinion that it would be highly undesirable that the well-known name *Myiobius* Darwin should be replaced by the name *Tyrannula*, 1827, and desire to support the proposal that, in order to prevent the confusion which would follow from the application of the normal rules in this case, the Commission should use its plenary powers in the manner proposed, that is, for the purpose of suppressing the name *Tyrannula* Swainson and for designating *Muscicapa barbata* Gmelin, 1788, to be the type species of *Myiobius* Darwin, 1839, thereby preserving that name for use in its accustomed sense.

The foregoing recommendation has the unanimous support of all the members of the Standing Committee, namely, J. Berlioz (*Museum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris*) ; Erwin Stresemann (*Zoologisches Museum der Universität, Berlin*) ; John T. Zimmer (*The American Museum of Natural History, New York*) (the applicant in the present case) and myself.

REQUEST FOR A RULING THAT THE TRIVIAL NAMES OF TWO WOODPECKERS, EACH CONSISTING OF A SLIGHT VARIANT OF A PREVIOUSLY PUBLISHED NAME BASED UPON A WORD TRANSLITERATED INTO THE LATIN ALPHABET FROM A LANGUAGE USING ANOTHER ALPHABET, BE TREATED AS JUNIOR HOMONYMS OF THE EARLIER NAMES SO PUBLISHED

By the Marquess HACHISUKA
(*Atami, Shizuoka Ken, Japan*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)678)

The purpose of the present application is to ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to give a ruling that the trivial names of two woodpeckers, each consisting of a slight variant of a previously published name based upon a word transliterated into the Latin alphabet from a language using another alphabet, are to be treated as junior homonyms of the earlier names so published. From the point of view of Japanese ornithologists the first of these cases is a matter of some urgency for the decennial revision of the *Handlist of the Japanese Birds* is now in preparation and it is particularly desired that the correct names for these birds should be used in it.

2. The birds concerned are now regarded as belonging to the genus *Picoides* Lacépède, 1799. The birds involved in the first case were originally described from material from the island of Sakhalin, the second from the Tianschan area. The names in question are the following :—

(1) *Dryobates leucotos saghalinensis* Yamashina, 1931 (*Tori* **7** : 1) becomes congeneric with *Picoides tridactylus sakhalinensis* Buterlin, 1907 (*Orn. Monatsber.* **15** : 10) on the union of *Dendrocopos* Koch, 1816 with *Picoides* Lacépède, 1799.

(2) *Dendrocopus* [sic] *major tianshanicus* Buterlin, 1910 (*Orn. Mitt.*, Moskau **1910** (3) : 200) becomes congeneric with *Picoides tridactylus tianschanicus* Buterlin, 1907 (*Orn. Monatsber.* **15** : 9) on the union of the genus *Dendrocopos* Koch, 1816, with the genus *Picoides* Lacépède, 1799.

3. There is no authoritative approved spelling either for the word used to denote the Island of Sakhalin or Saghalien, or for the word used as the name of the Tianschan or Tianshan Mountains. Both these names are based upon place names used in languages using alphabets other than the Latin alphabet and in existing circumstances it is not possible to establish that a Latinised version of these place names spelt in one way is more correct than that spelt in another way. Slight variations in spelling due to differences in transliteration are not open to any serious objection in the case of trivial names, where the species concerned are referred to different genera. The question does however become one of consequence when two species or subspecies in the same genus bear names that are essentially identical with one another, differing, in form, only through slight difference in transliteration. In the present instance, it would clearly be most confusing if in the same genus there were birds, whose valid names were respectively *saghalinensis* and *sakhalinensis* or *tianshanicus* and *tianschanicus.* Moreover, it would impose a quite unreasonable strain upon Article 34 of the *Règles* (as amended in Paris in 1948) to argue that the foregoing do not represent pairs of homonyms, merely because of the difficulty arising from the fact that we are concerned here not with true Latin words but with Latinised versions of words transcribed from other alphabets. I accordingly ask the International Commission to rule that, under Articles 19 and 34, read together, the words of which the foregoing pairs of names are composed are to be treated as homonyms of one another.

4. The request now actually submitted is that the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should :—

(1) rule that the following pairs of variant spellings are to be treated as homonyms of one another :—

(*a*) *saghalinensis* and *sakhalinensis :*

(*b*) *tianshanicus* and *tianschanicus :*

(2) place the following trivial names on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology ;*—

(*a*) *saghalinensis* Yamashima, 1931 (as published in the combination *Dryobates leucotos saghalinensis*) (invalid as a junior secondary homonym consequent upon the reference to the genus *Picoides* Lacépède, 1799, both of *Dryobates leucotos saghalinensis* Yamashima, 1931, and of *Picoides tridactylus sakhalinensis* Buterlin, 1907) ;

(*b*) *tianshanicus* Buterlin, 1910 (as published in the combination *Dendrocopus* [sic] *major tianshanicus*) (invalid as a junior secondary homonym consequent upon the reference to the genus *Picoides* Lacépède, 1799, both of *Dendrocopus major tianshanicus* Buterlin, 1910, and of *Picoides tridactylus tianschanicus* Buterlin, 1907).

Note by the Secretary to the Commission : It will be convenient in connection with the application submitted by the Marquess Hachisuka to recall that Dr. Helen Muir-Wood has already submitted an application (Z.N.(S.)530) which, though primarily concerned with the relative status of the names *Jakowleffia* Puton, 1875, and *Yakovlevia* Fredericks, 1925 (1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **6** : 90-92), raises a general question of principle essentially identical with that raised in the present application by the Marquess Hachisuka. For the only difference is that Dr. Muir-Wood's application is concerned with scientific names based upon the names of persons, while that of the Marquess Hachisuka is concerned with scientific names based upon the names of places or geographical features. It will, no doubt, be to the general convenience if both these aspects of this general problem are dealt with simultaneously by the Commission rather than that they should be treated as constituting separate problems. (signed) Francis Hemming. 24th September 1952.

PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO SUPPRESS THE TRIVIAL NAME "CYANEA" VIEILLOT, 1818 (AS PUBLISHED IN THE COMBINATION "MUSCICAPA CYANEA") FOR THE PURPOSE OF VALIDATING THE TRIVIAL NAME "CYANEA" HUME, 1877 (AS PUBLISHED IN THE COMBINATION "MUSCITREA CYANEA") (CLASS AVES)

By CHARLES VAURIE

(*The American Museum of Natural History, New York*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)686)

The object of the present application is to ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to use its plenary powers for the purpose of suppressing the trivial name *cyanea* Vieillot, 1818 (as published in the binominal combination *Muscicapa cyanea*), thus validating in the genus *Niltava* Hodgson, 1837 (*India Rev.* **1** : 650) the trivial name *cyanea* Hume, 1877 (as published in the binominal combination *Muscitrea cyanea*) (Class Aves). The details of this case are set out below.

2. The species represented by the nominal species *Muscicapa cyanea* Vieillot, 1818 (*Nouv. Dict. Hist. nat.* **21** : 447) is said to come from Timor and appears from Vieillot's description to be the same species as that which later was given the name *Muscicapa hyacinthina* Temminck, 1820 (*in* Temminck & Laugier, *Nouv. Rec. Planches color. Ois.* (5) : pl. 30, figs. 1, 2). The name given to it by Vieillot, which has never been used for it or cited in connection with it in the literature since the time of its original publication, is invalid, being a junior primary homonym of *Muscicapa cyanea* Müller, [1776] (*in* Linnaeus, *Syst. Nat. Suppl.* : 170).

3. The bird to which Hume in 1877 (*Stray Feathers* **5** : 101) gave the name *Muscitrea cyanea* is now treated as belonging to the genus *Niltava* Hodgson. Accordingly, there are now in that genus two species, each possessing the trivial name *cyanea*, namely (1) Temminck's *hyacinthina*, which, as explained above, has *cyanea* Vieillot in its synonymy, and (2) Hume's *cyanea*. Under the normal operation of the Rules, the latter name, as a junior secondary homonym, must be rejected as invalid. This name has however been in unchallenged use for about 75 years for the well-known Indian bird concerned and is the name that has been used for that bird in every standard work published during that period. The rejection of this name at this stage would lead to confusion and disturbance, unaccompanied by any corresponding benefit.

4. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is accordingly asked :—

(1) to use its plenary powers for the purpose of suppressing the trivial name *cyanea* Vieillot, 1818 (as published in the binominal combination *Muscicapa cyanea*) for the purposes of the Law of Homonymy ;

(2) to place the under-mentioned trivial names on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* :—

- (*a*) *cyanea* Hume, 1877 (as published in the binominal combination *Muscitrea cyanea*) ;
- (*b*) *cyanea* Müller, 1776 (as published in the binominal combination *Muscicapa cyanea*) ;
- (*c*) *hyacinthina* Temminck, 1820 (as published in the binominal combination *Muscicapa hyacinthina*) ;

(3) to place the trivial name *cyanea* Vieillot, 1818 (as published in the binominal combination *Muscicapa cyanea*), as proposed, under (1) above, to be suppressed under the plenary powers, on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology.*

PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO VALIDATE THE TRIVIAL NAME "FERRUGINEA" HODGSON, 1845 (AS PUBLISHED IN THE COMBINATION "HEMICHELIDON FERRUGINEA") BY THE SUPPRESSION OF THE TRIVIAL NAME "FERRUGINEA" MERREM, 1784 (AS PUBLISHED IN THE COMBINATION "MUSCICAPA FERRUGINEA") (CLASS AVES)

By CHARLES VAURIE

(*The American Museum of Natural History, New York*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)687)

The object of the present application is to ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to use its plenary powers to preserve the trivial name *ferruginea* Hodgson, 1845 (as published in the binominal combination *Hemichelidon ferruginea*) (Class Aves). The details of this case are set out below.

2. The species, which was treated as belonging to the genus *Hemichelidon* when it was first described and named *Hemichelidon ferruginea* Hodgson, 1845 (*Proc. zool. Soc. Lond.* **13**(146) : 32) is now placed in the genus *Muscicapa* Linnaeus, 1766. There is however a much older nominal species originally described as belonging to the genus *Muscicapa*, namely *Muscicapa ferruginea* Merrem, 1784 (*Avium rar. Icones* **1** : 19). Thus, the trivial name *ferruginea* Hodgson, 1845, is invalid, as a junior secondary homonym in the genus *Muscicapa.*

3. Merrem's work is not available to me, but according to a personal communication which I have received from Mr. H. G. Deignan (*U.S. National Museum, Washington*), both the species represented by *Muscicapa ferruginea* Merrem and its country of origin is uncertain. On the other hand, the bird to which Hodgson gave the name *Hemichelidon ferruginea* has been known by the trivial name *ferruginea* for 107 years and has been cited under that name by the authors of all standard works (Hartert 1910, *Die Vög. Paläarkt. Fauna* **1** : 479 ; Stuart Baker, *Faun. Brit. Ind.* ; R. B. Sharpe, *Cat. Birds Brit. Mus.* **4** : 122 ; F. N. Chasen, 1935, *Handlist of Malaysian Birds :* 163).

4. Great and quite unnecessary confusion and disturbance would be created by the rejection of the trivial name *ferruginea* Hodgson by reason of its being a junior secondary homonym in the genus *Muscicapa* of the trivial name *ferruginea* Merrem. This would be all the less justified in view of the fact that the name published by Merrem is a *nomen dubium*. It is to prevent this disturbance that this case is now submitted to the International Commission under the procedure prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology for dealing with problems presented by *nomina dubia* (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 76).

5. The application now submitted is that the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should :—

(1) use its plenary powers (*a*) to suppress the trivial name *ferruginea* Merrem, 1784 (as published in the binominal combination *Muscicapa ferruginea*) for the purposes both of the Law of Priority and of the Law of Homonymy, and (*b*) to validate the trivial name *ferruginea* Hodgson, 1845 (as published in the binominal combination *Hemichelidon ferruginea*) ;

(2) place the trivial name *ferruginea* Hodgson, 1845 (as published in the foregoing combination), as validated, under (1)(*b*) above, under the plenary powers, on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* ;

(3) place the under-mentioned trivial names on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* ;—

(*a*) *ferruginea* Merrem, 1784 (as published in the binominal combination *Muscicapa ferruginea*), as proposed, under (1)(*a*) above, to be suppressed under the plenary powers ;

(*b*) *ferrugineas* Hodgson, June 1844 (as published in the binominal combination *Hemichelidon ferruginea* Hodgson, 1844, Gray's *Zool. Miscell.* (6) : 84) (a *nomen nudum*).

CONTENTS

(*continued from front wrapper*)

New Applications

Page

(1) *Colymbus* Linnaeus, 1758 : (*a*) application for suppression of, and for validation of *Gavia* Forster, 1788, under the plenary powers, by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature ; (*b*) Report of position of, under *Règles*, the by Francis Hemming, *Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* 4

(2) Trivial name *caspicus* Hablizl, 1783 (as published in the combination *Colymbus caspicus*), proposed suppression of, under the plenary powers. By the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature 30

(3) Four trivial names published for birds by Lichtenstein in 1793, proposed suppression of, under the plenary powers. By the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature 32

(4) Trivial name *nortoniensis* Gmelin, 1789 (as published in the combination *Fringilla nortoniensis*), proposed suppression of, under the plenary powers. By the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature 38

(5) Seven trivial names published by Gmelin in 1788 and 1789 for birds which remained unidentified until 1950, proposed suppression of, under the plenary powers. Application by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature 40

(6) Three trivial names for birds published by Forster (J.R.) in 1794, proposed suppression of, under the plenary powers ; also proposed suppression under those powers of the trivial name *novaehollandiae* Latham, 1790 (as published in the combination *Muscicapa novaehollandiae*). (*a*) application by H. M. Whittle (*for Checklist Committee, Royal Australasian Ornithologists' Union*) ; (*b*) application by four United States ornithologists (Ernst Mayr *et al.*) and three Australian ornithologists (L. Clavert *et al.*) ; (*c*) note by Francis Hemming, *Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* ; (*d*) support by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature 44

(7) Three trivial names of birds, proposed acceptance, under Article 19, of emendations made for. By the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature 52

(8) *Pyrrhocorax* Tunstall, 1771, proposed validation of, under the plenary powers : (*a*) application by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature; (*b*) note by Francis Hemming, *Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* 53

(9) Trivial name of the Song Thrush, proposed validation of *philomelos* Brehm, 1831 (as published in the combination *Turdus philomelos*) as the trivial name for. By the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature .. 62

(10) Names for American birds published by Linnaeus in 1776 and completely overlooked until 1949, proposed suppression of, under the plenary powers. (*a*) application by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature, covering an application by nine United States ornithologists (E. R. Blake *et al.*) ; (*b*) note by Francis Hemming, *Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* 65

(11) Report by Francis Hemming (*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*) on the type species of certain genera of birds discussed but left unsettled, in *Opinion* 16 : support for action proposed received from Colonel R. Meinertzhagen 70

CONTENTS

(*continued from overleaf*)

Page

(12) Two Siberian birds, proposed addition of trivial names of, to the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology*. By the late James L. Peters (*Museum of Comparative Zoology, Cambridge, Mass, U.S.A.*) 77

(13 to 17) Proposals for the correction of errors relating to the names of birds placed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* in *Opinion* 67. By Francis Hemming, *Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*:

(*a*) *Ectopistes* Swainson, 1827: validation of *Columba migratoria* Linnaeus, 1766, as name of type species of 80

(*b*) *Balaeniceps* Gould: correction of date of publication of, and reference for 85

(*c*) *Oedicnemus* Temminck, 1815, proposed substitution of *Burhinus* Illiger, 1811, for 86

(*d*) *Bubo* Duméril, 1806; *Coturnix* Bonnaterre, 1790; *Egretta* Forster, 1817; *Oriolus* Linnaeus, 1766 89

(*e*) *Gallinago* Koch, 1816, proposed substitution of *Capella* Frenzel, 1801, for 93

(18) Trivial name *syriacus* Rothschild, 1910 (as published in the combination *Struthio camelus syriacus*), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* as the trivial name of the Syrian Ostrich. By Richard Meinertzhagen (*London*) 96

(19) *Myiobius* Darwin, 1839, proposed validation of, by suppression of *Tyrannula* Swainson, 1827, and designation of type species for, under the plenary powers. (*a*) application by John T. Zimmer (*The American Museum of Natural History, New York*); (*b*) support by the Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature 98

(20) Request for a ruling that the trivial names of two woodpeckers, each consisting of a slight variant of a previously published name based upon a word transliterated into the Latin alphabet from a language using another alphabet, be treated as junior homonyms of the earlier names so published. By the Marquess Hachisuka (*Atami, Shizuoka, Japan*) 102

(21) Trivial name *cyanea* Hume, 1877 (as published in the combination *Muscitrea cyanea*), proposed validation of, by suppression of *cyanea* Vieillot, 1818 (as published in the combination *Muscicapa cyanea*) under the plenary powers. By Charles Vaurie (*The American Museum of Natural History, New York*) 104

(22) Trivial name *ferruginea* Hodgson, 1845 (as published in the combination *Hemichelidon ferruginea*), proposed validation of, by suppression of *ferruginea* Merrem, 1784 (as published in the combination *Muscicapa ferruginea*) under the plenary powers. By Charles Vaurie (*The American Museum of Natural History, New York*) 105

Printed in Great Britain by Metchim and Son Ltd., Westminster, London

VOLUME 9. Double Part 4/5 *30th December* 1952
pp. 107-158, 1 pl.

THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

The Official Organ of

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Edited by

FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

CONTENTS:

Page
The Presidency of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature: Election of Professor J. Chester Bradley .. 107
Obituary: Dr. William Thomas Calman 108
Retirement of Mr. A. S. Pankhurst from the Office of Honorary Registrar to the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature 108

(*continued on back wrapper*)

LONDON:
Printed by Order of the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature

and

Sold on behalf of the International Commission by the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature at the Publications Office of the Trust
41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.
1952

Price Seventeen Shillings

(*All rights reserved*)

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

A. The Officers of the Commission

Honorary Life President: Dr. Karl Jordan (United Kingdom)

President: Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.)

Vice-President: Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (Brazil)

Secretary: Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom)

B. The Members of the Commission

(*Arranged in order of precedence by reference to date of election or of most recent re-election, as prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology*)

Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (Brazil) (*Vice-President*) (1st January 1944)
Professor J. R. Dymond (Canada) (1st January 1944)
Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.) (*President*) (28th March 1944)
Professor Harold E. Vokes (U.S.A.) (23rd April 1944)
Professor Bela Hankó (Hungary) (1st January 1947)
Dr. Norman R. Stoll (U.S.A.) (1st January 1947)
Professor H. Boschma (Netherlands) (1st January 1947)
Senor Dr. Angel Cabrera (Argentina) (27th July 1948)
Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) (*Secretary*) (27th July 1948)
Dr. Joseph Pearson (Australia) (27th July 1948)
Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark) (27th July 1948)
Professor Teiso Esaki (Japan) (17th April 1950)
Professor Pierre Bonnet (France) (9th June 1950)
Mr. Norman Denbigh Riley (United Kingdom) (9th June 1950)
Professor Tadeusz Jaczewski (Poland) (15th June 1950)
Professor Robert Mertens (Germany) (5th July 1950)
Professor Erich Martin Hering (Germany) (5th July 1950)

C. The Staff of the Secretariat of the Commission

Honorary Secretary: Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Honorary Personal Assistant to the Secretary : Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming

Honorary Archivist: Mr. Francis J. Griffin, A.L.A.

D. The Staff of the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature

Honorary Secretary and Managing Director: Mr. Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Publications Officer: Mrs. C. Rosner

E. The Addresses of the Commission and the Trust

Secretariat of the Commission: 28, Park Village East, Regent's Park, London, N.W.1

Offices of the Trust: 41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7

BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Volume 9, Double Part 4/5 (pp. 107-158, 1 pl.) 30th December 1952

THE PRESIDENCY OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature has pleasure in announcing the election of Professor James Chester Bradley, Professor Emeritus of Entomology, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A., one of the United States Representatives on the International Commission since 1944, to be President of the International Commission, with effect from 27th November 1952, in succession to the late Dr. James Lee Peters, Museum of Comparative Zoology at Harvard College, Cambridge, Massachussetts, U.S.A.

WILLIAM THOMAS CALMAN

1871-1952

It is announced with the greatest regret that the death occurred on 29th September 1952 of Dr. William Thomas Calman, C.B., D.Sc., F.R.S., one of the United Kingdom Representatives on the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature since 1935.

An Obituary Notice will be published as soon as possible.

Retirement of Mr. Albert Stanley Pankhurst from the Office of Honorary Registrar to the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature

It is with great regret that the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature announce that it has accepted the resignation of Mr. Albert Stanley Pankhurst, C.B.E., from the Office of Honorary Registrar to the Trust.

Mr. Pankhurst was one of the original subscribers to the Memorandum and Articles of Association of the Trust at the time when it was incorporated in 1947, and ever since has held the office of Honorary Registrar, in which capacity he has rendered valuable service to the Trust. Mr. Pankhurst's resignation is occasioned by his acceptance of a post under the United Nations in the Middle East, which will necessitate his living outside the United Kingdom for at least a year. At the request of the Committee of Management, Mr. Pankhurst has consented to remain a member of the Trust, whose hope it is that on the completion of the term of service in his new appointment, Mr. Pankhurst will be able to resume his active association with the work of the Trust.

NOTICES PRESCRIBED BY THE INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ZOOLOGY

The following notices are given in pursuance of decisions taken, on the recommendation of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 51-56, 57-59), by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, July 1948 (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **5** : 5-13, 131).

(a) Date of commencement by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of voting on applications published in the " Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature "

Notice is hereby given that normally the International Commission will start to vote upon applications published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* on the expiry of a period of six calendar months from the date of publication in the *Bulletin* of the applications in question. Any specialist who may desire to comment upon any of the applications published in the present Part (vol. 9, Double Part 4/5) of the *Bulletin* is accordingly invited to do so in writing to the Secretary to the Commission, as quickly as possible and in any case, in sufficient time to enable the communication in question to reach the Secretariat of the Commission before the expiry of the six-month period referred to above.

(b) Notice of the possible use by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of its plenary powers in certain cases

Notice is hereby given that the possible use by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of its plenary powers is involved in applications published in the present Part of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* (Vol. 9, Double Part 4/5) in relation to the following names :—

(*a*) *Astacus* Fabricius, 1775 (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda), validation of (correction of an error in *Opinion* 104) (Z.N.(S.)544) ;

(*b*) *Favus* Lanchester, 1900 (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda), validation of (correction of an error in *Opinion* 73) (Z.N.(S.)557) ;

(*c*) *flavipes* Olivier, 1795 (*Dytiscus*) (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera), validation of, by suppression of *flavipes* Fabricius, 1792 (*Dytiscus*) (Z.N.(S.)667).

2. The present Part contains also an application that the normal provisions of the *Règles* should be strictly applied to the generic names *Portunus* Weber, 1795, and *Macropipus* Prestandrea, 1833 (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda) and that those names should therefore be placed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* with *Cancer pelagicus* Linnaeus, 1758, and *Portunus macropipus* Prestandrea, 1833, as their respective type species, it not being desirable, in the opinion of the applicant, that the plenary powers should be used in this case (Z.N.(S.)642).

3. Comments on the foregoing applications should be addressed to the Secretary, International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature (address: 28 Park Village East, Regent's Park, London, N.W.1, England). If received in sufficient time, comments so received will be published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*; other comments, provided that they are received within the prescribed period of six calendar months from the date of publication of the present Part, will be laid before the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at the time of commencement of voting on the application concerned.

4. In accordance with the procedure agreed upon at the Session held by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in Paris in 1948 (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 56), corresponding Notices have been sent to the journals " Nature " and " Science."

FRANCIS HEMMING,
Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

28, Park Village East, Regent's Park,
LONDON, N.W.1, England.

30th December 1952.

JAMES LEE PETERS
1889-1952

JAMES LEE PETERS

1889-1952

James Lee Peters, President of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and author of seven volumes of the " Check-List of Birds of the World," died on Saturday, April 19, 1952, at Cambridge, Massachusetts, U.S.A. On April 10th he had suffered a severe coronary thrombosis, and this, complicated by pneumonia, rapidly brought death.

Even in childhood his interest had been in birds, and much of his boyhood was spent with the great collections at the Museum of Comparative Zoology at Harvard College. These were not far from Jamaica Plan, a suburb of Boston, his first home and where he was born on August 13, 1889. He was the son of Austin Peters, and Frances Lee, both of whom encouraged him in his interest in birds. During school and college years he was making a collection of his own and shortly after graduation from Harvard he was collecting in Mexico for the Harvard University Museum. In later years he worked also in the West Indies, and in Central and South America. Except for a short time, during which he was employed by the Biological Survey of the United States Government, and service in the army in France during World War I, his connection with Harvard was never severed. In 1921 he was appointed Assistant in Ornithology, in 1927 Assistant Curator of Birds, and Curator in 1933. In that year he was married to Miss Eleanor K. Sweet, who had been Librarian there. They lived together on a quiet farm in the village of Harvard, Massachusetts.

Little was allowed to distract him from his work. Occasionally he was tired after fighting a fire in the village. Editing " Bird-Banding," a magazine devoted to the ringing of birds, occupied some time during the years 1939 through 1950. He was secretary of the board of the local hospital, and although his apple orchard was of great interest to him for many years, he gave this up latterly.

Just a year before his marriage and appointment as Curator, the first volume of the " Check-List " appeared ; the succeeding books were published in 1934, 1937, 1940, 1945, 1948 and 1951. These are lists of the birds of the world, together with their geographical ranges and references to previous workers. Increasing demand for them indicates their value to zoologists. They are indeed a memorial to the meticulous habits of his working life. Although the biological implication of any list of animals may be severely criticised by future zoologists—and no doubt will be—such, in this case, can only be based on the limitations that nomenclature imposes upon biology. Peters's mechanical accuracy within this framework can only be applauded. It illuminates a sense of compromise and an abnegation that were quite characteristic of its author. Less in his conversation, which contained little hint of the pedagogue, but often in his correspondence, appear the words " caution " and " deliberation." Accurate solution of the problem at hand was always important to him, never personal advancement.

And so, little by little and day by day, he was recognised by his peers. He was President of the American Ornithologists' Union from 1943 through 1945, and a member of the Cooper Club of California, the Biological Society of Washington, the Washington Academy of Sciences, the American Academy of Sciences, the American Society of Mammalogists, Sigma Xi, the Society of Systematic Zoologists, and the Nuttall Ornithological Club of Cambridge, of which he was President from 1942 until his death. In Europe and South America the *Deutsche Ornithologische Gesellschaft* of Berlin, Germany; the *Ornithologische Gesellschaft Bayern* of Munich, Germany; and the *Sociedad Ornithologica del Plata* of Buenos Aires elected him to membership.

He was elected a member of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in September 1933, succeeding Dr. David Starr Jordan. In March 1945 he became Vice-President and President in July 1948, succeeding Dr. Karl Jordan. His interest here were in the solution of specific problems of nomenclature rather than the multitude of distracting details of administration.

Meticulous, selfless work and its result have brought him the respect and admiration of zoologists.

J. C. G.

PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO CORRECT AN ERRONEOUS ENTRY RELATING TO THE NAME "ASTACUS" PALLAS, 1772 (CLASS CRUSTACEA, ORDER DECAPODA), MADE IN THE "OFFICIAL LIST OF GENERIC NAMES IN ZOOLOGY" IN "OPINION" 104

By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.
(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)544)

The subject matter of the present application came to notice in connection with the routine checking of the entries on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* in connection with the projected publication of the *Official List* in book form, and is concerned with the erroneous entry of the name *Astacus* Pallas, 1772 (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda) on that *List* made in the Commission's *Opinion* 104 (1928, *Smithson. misc. Coll.* **73** (No. 5) : 27).

2. Entry relating to the generic name "Astacus" Pallas, 1772, made on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" in Opinion 104: In *Opinion* 104 (: 27) the reference given for the name *Astacus* was " Pallas, 1772, p. 81." The reference so given is clearly to page 81 of Volume 9 of Pallas's *Spicilogia Zoologiae*, where the name *Astacus* was in fact used by Pallas. The particulars given for the name *Astacus* Pallas, 1772, in *Opinion* 104 were as follows :—" tat. [type species by absolute tautonymy] *Cancer astacus* Linn. 1758a, 631, syn. *fluviatilis* Fab. 1775a, 413."

3. Incorrect type species given for "Astacus" Pallas, 1772, in "Opinion" 104 : On referring to Volume 9 of Pallas's *Spicil. Zool.*, I found that in the paper concerned Pallas confined himself to the description of a new Siberian species of crayfish, to which he gave the name *Astacus dauuricus*. No other species was mentioned by Pallas and the above nominal species is therefore unquestionably the type species of *Astacus* Pallas by monotypy, for, as will be recalled, the Commission had ruled in *Opinion* 47 as far back as 1912 (*Smithson. Publ.* **2060** : 108-109) that a genus is to be treated as monotypical if one species only was cited by name by its original author, even if that author made it clear that he considered that other species which he did not cite by name belonged to the genus also, a decision which, in substance, was written into the *Règles* by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology at Paris in 1948 (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 153). Accordingly, the statement in *Opinion* 104 that *Cancer astacus* Linnaeus, 1758 (*Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 631) is the type species of the genus *Astacus* Pallas, 1772, is incorrect. In his description of his new species *Astacus dauuricus*, Pallas said (in the first sentence) : " Forma atque proportione astaco nostrati minori persimilis est," and it is possible that the applicant in the case which was decided upon in *Opinion* 104 may have interpreted Pallas' reference to (translated into English) " our crayfish " as constituting obliquely the inclusion of *Cancer astacus* Linnaeus, 1758, in the genus *Astacus* Pallas, 1772. Whether or not this is the explanation of the statement in *Opinion* 104 regarding the type species of *Astacus* Pallas, that statement is, as we have seen, incorrect. It is necessary therefore to consider what action should now be taken to correct or validate the entry on the *Official List* relating to this name.

4. Two possible courses of action : When I first considered this matter, it seemed to me that, other things being equal, there were two courses of action open to the Commission, each of which involved the admission that the entry on the *Official List* relating to the name *Astacus* Pallas was defective. (1) The Commission might confine itself to correcting the mistake in *Opinion* 104, that is, to giving an emended ruling stating that the type species of *Astacus* Pallas, 1772, was *Astacus dauuricus* Pallas, 1772, by monotypy, and not (as incorrectly stated in the foregoing *Opinion*) *Cancer astacus* Linnaeus, 1758, by absolute tautonymy. Clearly, the practicability of this course would depend upon whether, in the opinion of specialists, *Astacus dauuricus* Pallas, 1772, and *Cancer astacus* Linnaeus, 1758, were not only congeneric with one another but were also so closely allied that there was no reasonable risk that at some later date they would be placed in different genera with the result that *Cancer astacus* Linnaeus would cease to be subjectively referable to the genus *Astacus* Pallas. (2) It would be possible for the Commission to decide that it was so important to ensure that *Cancer astacus* Linnaeus should be permanently retained in the genus *Astacus* that the proper course for it to adopt would be to use its plenary powers to designate that species to be the type species of *Astacus* Pallas, thereby giving valid force to the until then invalid entry in regard to this generic name made in the *Official List* in *Opinion* 104.

5. Advice received from Dr. L. B. Holthuis (Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The Netherlands) : At this point I put this question (in a letter dated 6th June 1951) to Dr. L. B. Holthuis (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The Netherlands*). In his reply, dated 8th June 1951, which is being published simultaneously with the present paper, Dr. Holthuis informed me that the species *Astacus dauuricus* Pallas, 1772, was no longer considered to be congeneric with *Cancer astacus* Linnaeus, being currently referred to the genus *Cambaroides* Faxon, 1884 (*Proc. Amer. Acad Arts Sci.*, Boston **20** : 149), of which the type species was *Astacus japonicus* De Haan, 1841 (*Faun. japon.*, Crust. (5) : 164, pl. 35, fig. 9), by subsequent selection by Faxon (1898, *Proc. U.S. nat. Mus.* **20** : 665). Dr. Holthuis accordingly considered that it was " highly desirable that the Commission should take steps to prevent the confusion, which undoubtedly will arise if *Astacus dauuricus* Pallas is accepted as the type species of *Astacus*." Of the two alternative courses outlined in my letter (i.e. the two alternatives set out in paragraph 4 above), Dr. Holthuis was altogether opposed to the first, and, if no other course were open, would favour the second. Dr. Holthuis went on, however, to outline a third course (which, like my alternative (2), would involve the use by the Commission of its plenary powers) which, in his opinion, offered the best solution obtainable. Dr. Holthuis pointed out that, notwithstanding the entry on the *Official List* of *Astacus* Pallas, 1772, under *Opinion* 104, most authors treated the name *Astacus* as having been first published by Fabricius in 1775 (*Syst. Ent.* : 413) ; if that practice could be validated, no difficulty would arise in regard to the type species of this genus, since the type species of *Astacus* Fabricius, 1775, was, by selection by Latreille (1810, *Consid. gén. Crust. Arach. Ins.* : 422) the nominal species *Astacus fluviatilis* Fabricius, 1775 (*Syst. Ent.* : 413), a nominal species which was objectively identical with the nominal species

Cancer astacus Linnaeus, 1758 (the name *Astacus fluviatilis* Fabricius being only a *nom. nov.* for *Cancer astacus* Linnaeus). Dr. Holthuis accordingly suggested that the difficulty created by the mistake in *Opinion* 104 should be overcome by the Commission using its plenary powers to validate *Astacus* Fabricius, 1775 (*Astacus* Pallas, 1772, being at the same time removed from the *Official List*), rather than for the purpose of designating *Cancer astacus* Linnaeus to be the type species of *Astacus* Pallas, 1772.

6. Solution recommended : It is clearly essential that such steps as may be necessary should be taken to provide a legal foundation for the current use of such an important name as *Astacus* ; the only question therefore is how best this object can be secured. In view of the fact that (as Dr. Holthuis has explained) the majority of specialists still attribute this name to Fabricius, there would be an obvious advantage in stabilising the name *Astacus* as from that author. The force of this consideration is greatly strengthened by the fact that, if this course were to be adopted, there would no longer be any problem to solve as regards the type species of this genus. On general principles, it will also, I think, be felt that it is better to use the plenary powers for the purpose of giving valid force to action taken by an early author (in this case, by Fabricius in 1775) rather than to use those powers for the purpose of securing the same end by designating as the type species of a genus a species not included in it by its original author (in this case, by Pallas in 1772). My recommendation to the Commission is therefore that it should adopt Dr. Holthuis' suggestion and, by suppressing the name *Astacus* Pallas, 1772, under the plenary powers, so provide a firm foundation for the name *Astacus* Fabricius, 1775.

7. Uses of the generic name " Astacus " prior to Fabricius, 1775 : In the case of generic names published in the immediate sub-Linnean age, it is essential to take special steps to secure that the usage which it is proposed to accept for any given generic name has not been anticipated by some earlier author, for, owing to the imperfect state of knowledge regarding many of these rare XVIIIth century works, it is still extremely easy to overlook an early usage of a generic name, especially one which was taken over from the pre-1758 zoologists. In the present case I investigated this problem in conjunction with Dr. Karl Jordan, then President of the Commission, during the war (in 1944). From this investigation, it appeared that the name *Astacus* had been used as a generic name on three occasions prior to its use as such by Pallas in 1772. These uses were :—(1) *Astacus* Borlase, 1758, *Nat. Hist. Cornwall* : 274 ; (2) *Astacus* Gronovius, 1762, *Acta Helv.* **5** : 365 (not Vol. 4, published in 1760, as frequently stated in lists) ; (3) Gronovius, 1764, *Zoophylac. gronov.* : 227. At that time nothing was known as to the nature of Borlase's book, while Gronovius was a non-binominal " binary " author and, pending a decision (which was, in fact, taken in 1948) on the general problem of the meaning of the expression " binary nomenclature ", the status of generic names published in his books was a matter of doubt. Quite recently I examined the position as regards the status of names in Borlase's *Natural History of Cornwall*, primarily as a general problem but partly also with special reference to the name *Astacus*. In the application which I have submitted to the Commission on this subject (Application Z.N.(S.)543), which was published in September 1951 (Hemming, 1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **6** : 115-118), I showed that Borlase could in no sense be regarded as a binominal author, and I recommended that the name *Astacus* Borlase, 1758, and also the name *Astacus* as used by the non-binominal "binary" author Gronovius in 1762 and 1764 should be placed on the *Official List of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology*. For the present purposes these three old uses of the name *Astacus* may therefore be set on one side, no further action being necessary in regard to them. Needless to say, however, it will be necessary to suppress under the plenary powers the undoubtedly available name *Astacus* Pallas, 1772, if the name *Astacus* Fabricius, 1775, is to be rendered available. For the reasons explained above, the possibility cannot be excluded that the investigation carried out by Dr. Jordan and myself in 1944 may have failed to detect every use of the name *Astacus* between 1758 and 1772, while it is possible also that this name may have been used by some author in the period 1772-1775, which was not covered by the survey which we then carried out. In these circumstances, it would, I think, be prudent to follow the precedent set in similar cases, e.g. the case of the Echinoid name *Spatangus* (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 526), that is, to use the plenary powers to suppress not only the name *Astacus* Pallas, 1772, but also any other use of that name prior to Fabricius, 1775, which would otherwise be available and would therefore invalidate *Astacus* Fabricius, 1775, as a junior homonym.

8. Name to be used for the type species of "Astacus" Fabricius, 1775 : As has already been noted (paragraph 5 above), (1) the nominal species which is the type species of *Astacus* Fabricius, 1775, is *Astacus fluviatilis* Fabricius, 1775, but (2) that nominal species is objectively identical with the nominal species *Cancer astacus* Linnaeus, 1758, the name *Astacus fluviatilis* Fabricius being only a *nom. nov.* for the name *Cancer astacus* Linnaeus, coined by Fabricius when he introduced for it the generic name *Astacus*, this action being due, no doubt, to the dislike entertained by Fabricius, in common with most of his contemporaries, for tautonymy between generic names and specific trivial names. The Commission has in recent times made it a practice, when using the plenary powers in relation to a given generic name, to use those powers also to secure that the nominal species which is the type species of that genus shall be whatever nominal species has the oldest available name for the taxonomic species which is, or which it is desired to make, the type species of that genus. In view of the fact that it will be necessary to use the plenary powers to suppress the name *Astacus* Pallas, 1772, if the name *Astacus* Fabricius, 1775, is to be validated, it is suggested that at the same time those powers should be used to designate *Cancer astacus* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of this genus in lieu of the objectively identical, but later established, nominal species *Astacus fluviatilis* Fabricius, 1775.

9. Urgency of the present case : In view of the fact that the present application is designed to secure a correction of an erroneous entry on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* made in an earlier *Opinion* rendered by the Commission, the need for a decision is very pressing, for, until decisions have been taken by the Commission in this, and certain similar, cases, the publication of the *Official List* in book form will inevitably be delayed.

10. Action recommended : In the light of the foregoing considerations, the following recommendations are submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, namely that it should :—

(1) delete the name *Astacus* Pallas, 1772, from the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology, Opinion* 104 being at the same time amended to the extent necessary for this purpose ;

(2) use its plenary powers :—
  - (*a*) to suppress for the purposes, both of the Law of Priority and of the Law of Homonymy :—
    - (i) *Astacus* Pallas, 1772 ;
    - (ii) *Astacus*, any other otherwise available use of, as a generic name prior to *Astacus* Fabricius, 1775 ;
  - (*b*) to designate *Cancer astacus* Linnaeus, 1758, in lieu of the objectively identical, but later established nominal species *Astacus fluviatilis* Fabricius, 1775, to be the type species of *Astacus* Fabricius, 1775 ;

(3) place the under-mentioned generic names on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology ;—*
  - (*a*) *Astacus* Fabricius, 1775 (gender of generic name : masculine) (type species, by designation, as proposed in (2) (*b*) above, under the plenary powers : *Cancer astacus* Linnaeus, 1758) (to be inserted on the *Official List* in the place rendered vacant by the removal therefrom, under (1) above, of the name *Astacus* Pallas, 1772) ;
  - (*b*) *Cambaroides* Faxon, 1884 (gender of generic name : masculine) (type species, by selection by Faxon (1898) : *Astacus japonicus* de Haan, 1841) ;

(4) place the following names on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology ;—*
  - (*a*) *astacus* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the combination *Cancer astacus*) (trivial name of species proposed, under (2) (*b*) above, to be designated under the plenary powers to be the type species of *Astacus* Fabricius, 1775) ;
  - (*b*) *japonicus* de Haan, 1841 (as published in the combination *Astacus japonicus*) (trivial name of type species of *Cambaroides* Faxon, 1884) ;

(5) place the following names on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology ;—*
  - (*a*) the names specified in (2) (*a*) above, as there proposed to be suppressed under the plenary Powers ;
  - (*b*) *Astacus* Erichson, 1847, *Arch. Naturgesch.* **13** (1) : 101 (a junior homonym of *Astacus* Fabricius, 1775) ;

(6) place the trivial name *fluviatilis* Fabricius, 1775 (as published in the combination *Astacus fluviatilis*) (trivial name of an objective junior synonym of *Cancer astacus* Linnaeus, 1758) on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology.*

ON THE ACTION WHICH IT IS DESIRABLE SHOULD BE TAKEN TO CORRECT THE ERRONEOUS ENTRY RELATING TO THE NAME " ASTACUS " PALLAS, 1772 (CLASS CRUSTACEA, ORDER DECAPODA) MADE IN THE " OFFICIAL LIST OF GENERIC NAMES IN ZOOLOGY " BY " OPINION " 104

By L. B. HOLTHUIS

(*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The Netherlands*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)544)

(Extract from a letter dated 8th June 1951)

Thank you so much for your letter Z.N.(S.)544 of 6th June concerning *Astacus* Pallas, 1772 (*Spicil. Zool.* **9** : 81) type species : *Astacus dauuricus* Pallas, 1772 (*Spicil. Zool.* **9** : 81) monotypic.

As to your questions concerning Pallas's species I can give you the following information. *Astacus dauuricus* Pallas is a well recognisable species and the trivial name *dauuricus*, being the oldest name available for the species, at present still is in common usage. The species, however, is no longer retained in the genus *Astacus*, but is placed in a separate genus *Cambaroides* Faxon (1884, *Proc. Amer. Acad. Arts Sci.* **20** : 149) type : *Astacus japonicus* De Haan (1841, *Fauna japon.* Crust. (5) : 164, pl. 35 fig. 9) by subsequent designation Faxon (1898, *Proc. U.S. nat. Mus.* **20** : 665). Faxon (1884) described *Cambaroides* as a subgenus of *Astacus*, but Stebbing (1893, *Hist. Crust.* : 208) raised it to the rank of a genus, in which he is followed by all modern authors.

To me it seems highly desirable that the Commission should undertake steps to prevent the confusion, which undoubtedly will be the result if *Astacus dauuricus* Pallas is chosen to be the type species of the genus *Astacus*. From the two alternatives mentioned in your letter therefore I certainly would choose the second, and let the Commission use its plenary powers to make *Cancer astacus* Linnaeus (1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 631) the type species of the genus *Astacus*.

I would suggest therefore that the Commission should not place *Astacus* Pallas, 1772, on the *Official List*, but *Astacus* Fabricius, 1775 (*Syst. Ent.* : 413) type species : *Astacus fluviatilis* Fabricius (1775, *Syst. Ent.* : 413) (=*Cancer astacus* Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 631) type by subsequent selection (Latreille, 1810, *Consid. gén. Crust. Arachn. Ins.* : 422). Nearly all authors using the generic name *Astacus* attribute it to Fabricius, 1775.

PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO VALIDATE THE NAME "FAVUS" LANCHESTER, 1900 (CLASS CRUSTACEA, ORDER DECAPODA) (PROPOSED CORRECTION OF AN ERROR IN "OPINION" 73)

By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)557)

The object of the present application is to ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to use its plenary powers for the purpose of validating the name *Favus* Lanchester, 1900 (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda) an invalid name inadvertently placed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* in the Commission's *Opinion* 73 (1922, *Smithson. misc. Coll.* **73** (No. 1) : 27). The error involved was detected in the course of preparations for the publication of the first instalment of the *Official List* in book form. In view of the widespread demand for the early publication of the foregoing volume and the fact that publication cannot take place until a decision has been taken on this and certain other cases where errors have been detected, it is hoped that the International Commission will give all practicable priority to the consideration of the present application.

2. The name *Favus* Lanchester, 1900 (*Proc. zool. Soc. Lond.* **1900** : 767) was published for a genus of which *Favus granulatus* Lanchester, 1900 (*Proc. zool. Soc. Lond.* **1900** : 768) is the type species by monotypy. This name was included in a long list of the names of genera of Decapoda recommended to the International Commission in 1915 for inclusion in the *Official List* as names that were nomenclatorially available and taxonomically required. It was on this basis that it was placed on the *Official List* in the Commission's *Opinion* 73.

3. The routine checking of names placed on the *Official List* involves, *inter alia*, looking up each name in the latest *Nomenclator* (Neave's *Nomencl. zool.*) for the purpose of making as sure as possible that investigations carried out since the name in question was placed on the *Official List* have not brought to light the existence of an older homonym, thus rendering invalid the name placed on the *Official List*. In the present case this check brought to light the existence of the previously overlooked name *Favus* Schafheutel, 1850 (*Geogn. Unters. südbay. Alpengeb.* : 44), established for a genus of fossils.

4. The name *Favus* Lanchester, 1900, is consequently an invalid name, and it is necessary therefore to consider what action should be taken in view of the fact that (as explained above) this name is on the *Official List*. The first point that has to be examined is whether the name *Favus* Schafheutel, 1850 (the name which is responsible for invalidating *Favus* Lanchester, 1900) is a name in use in the group of fossils concerned, for, if this were found to be the case, the position would clearly be quite different from that which would arise if it were found that the name *Favus* Schafheutel was some old synonym that was not in use and the disappearance of which would cause no inconvenience whatever in the group concerned. It appears from inquiries made that not only is the name *Favus* Schafheutel not in use by palaeonotologists but also that the indication given by Schafheutel for this genus is so scanty that it cannot be stated with certainty to which of the major groups of the Animal Kingdom this genus should be referred. Neave (in his *Nomenclator* **2** : 401) gave only the indication "?Protozoa."

5. It is quite clear therefore that, if the Commission were to decide to use its plenary powers to suppress the name *Favus* Schafheutel, 1850, for the purpose of validating the name *Favus* Lanchester, 1900, that action would not cause the slightest inconvenience to any palaeonotologist, consisting (as it would) merely in the removal of an unwanted *nomen dubium*. On the other hand, it is through the action of the Commission itself that the name *Favus* Lanchester has for nearly thirty years been on the *Official List*, and for the whole of that period systematists have therefore been led to believe that it was an available name and the correct name to use for the genus concerned. The fact that a name has been on the *Official List* for so long a period would afford no ground for retaining it on the *List*, if it were to be found that to do so would involve the suppression of a name as commonly used, or more commonly used, in some other group. But this is not the position in the present instance, for the fact that the name *Favus* Lanchester is now seen to be invalid is due solely to the excavation from the literature of a name published a hundred years ago which is not only not in use but in addition applies to a nominal genus that was so badly characterised by its original author that it is not possible definitely to establish the position of the genus in the Animal Kingdom and in consequence the name is a *nomen dubium*. In the present case, therefore, no inconvenience of any kind would result from the suppression of the name *Favus* Schafheutel, 1850, while the interests of stability would certainly be promoted by this course, enabling, as it would, the name *Favus* Lanchester, 1900, to retain the position which it has for so long occupied on the *Official List*. The Congress has clearly indicated that names, once placed on the *Official List*, are not lightly to be removed therefrom (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 268, point (*c*)), and it appears that the present is a case where it would be in accordance with the spirit of the foregoing decision that the unwanted and unused name *Favus* Schafheutel, 1850, should be suppressed under the plenary powers, in order to permit the name *Favus* Lanchester, 1900, to retain the position which it has for so long occupied on the *Official List*.

6. It is accordingly recommended that the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should :—

(1) use its plenary powers to suppress for the purposes both of the Law of Priority and of the Law of Homonymy the generic name *Favus* Schafheutel, 1850 ;

(2) confirm the name *Favus* Lanchester, 1900 (gender : masculine) in its position on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology ;*

(3) place the name *Favus* Schafheutel, 1850, on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology ;*

(4) place the trivial name *granulatus* Lanchester, 1900 (as published in the binominal combination *Favus granulatus*) (trivial name of type species of *Favus* Lanchester, 1900) on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology.*

ON THE PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO VALIDATE THE ENTRY ON THE "OFFICIAL LIST OF GENERIC NAMES IN ZOOLOGY" OF "FAVUS" LANCHESTER, 1900 (CLASS CRUSTACEA, ORDER DECAPODA)

By L. B. HOLTHUIS

(*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The Netherlands*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)557)

(Extract from a letter dated 6th June 1951)

Your proposal to validate the generic name *Favus* Lanchester, 1900, by suppressing the name *Favus* Schafheutel, 1850, seems to me to be the best solution in the present case.

SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO VALIDATE THE ENTRY ON THE "OFFICIAL LIST OF GENERIC NAMES IN ZOOLOGY" OF THE NAME "FAVUS" LANCHESTER, 1900 (CLASS CRUSTACEA, ORDER DECAPODA)

By M. F. W. TWEEDIE

(*Raffles Museum and Library, Singapore*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)557)

(Letter dated 20th September 1952)

I have your letter of 13th September regarding the name *Favus* under reference Z.N.(S.)557.

I entirely support your proposal to establish the Leucosiid genus *Favus* Lanchester as a valid genus.

SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO VALIDATE THE ENTRY ON THE "OFFICIAL LIST OF GENERIC NAMES IN ZOOLOGY" OF THE NAME "FAVUS" LANCHESTER, 1900 (CLASS CRUSTACEA, ORDER DECAPODA)

By I. GORDON, D.Sc., Ph.D.

(*British Museum (Natural History), London*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)557)

(Letter dated 25th September 1952)

I support the action proposed in the case of the name *Favus* Lanchester, 1900. It seems the sensible thing to do, since the fossil genus *Favus* Schafheutel, 1850, is not in current use in palaeontology.

SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSED VALIDATION OF THE GENERIC NAME "FAVUS" LANCHESTER, 1900 (CLASS CRUSTACEA, ORDER DECAPODA) UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS

By HEINRICH BALSS

(*Hauptkonservator der Zoologischen Staatsammlung, München, a.D., Germany*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)557)

(Letter dated 9th October 1952)

In Erwiderung Ihrer freundlichen Zeilen, die hierher nachgesandt wurden; meine Meinung deckt sich ganz mit der Ihrigen und ich stimme dafür, dass 1. der Name *Favus* Lanchester auf der offiziellen Liste der generischen Namen bestehen bleibt, und dass 2. der Name *Favus* Schafheutel, 1850, auf den offiziellen Index der rejected and invalid generischen Namen gesetzt wird.

PROPOSED ADDITION OF THE GENERIC NAMES "PORTUNUS" WEBER, 1795, AND "MACROPIPUS" PRESTANDREA, 1833 (CLASS CRUSTACEA, ORDER DECAPODA) TO THE "OFFICIAL LIST OF GENERIC NAMES IN ZOOLOGY"

By L. B. HOLTHUIS

(*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The Netherlands*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)642)

The problem concerning the generic name *Portunus* Weber, 1795, one of the most annoying questions in the nomenclature of the Decapoda Brachyura, is similar in many respects to the problems offered by the names of the Crustacean genera *Alpheus* Fabricius, *Crangon* Fabricius, and *Carcinus* Leach (see 1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **2** : 69, 99). In the present case too, a commonly used generic name was discovered around 1900 to be incorrectly employed for the genus to which it was currently applied. As in the above-mentioned cases, it was Miss Mary J. Rathbun who made this discovery and who accordingly changed the name of the genus in question by using the name that she thought to be nomenclatorially correct. As at the time when Miss Rathbun published her discoveries, no official suspension of the International Rules was possible, her action was the only proper way to deal with this problem. Practically all American carcinologists subsequently adopted Miss Rathbun's solution, while most European authors resented her action and did not accept the proposed changes. This difference in attitude between the American and European authors towards the present problem continues to this day, and the confusion caused thereby in carcinological literature has attained a stage that is intolerable and that should be ended at all costs. This is the reason why the present proposal is submitted to the International Commission for consideration and decision.

2. The original references to the generic names dealt with in the present proposal are the following :

Portunus Weber, 1795, *Nomencl. entomol.* : 93 (type species, by selection by Rathbun, 1926 (*Bull. U. S. nat. Mus.* **138** : 75) : *Cancer pelagicus* Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 626). Gender : masculine.

Portunus Fabricius, 1798, *Suppl. Ent. syst.* : 325, 363 (type species, by selection by Latreille, 1810 (*Consid. gén. Crust. Arachn. Ins.* 422) : *Cancer pelagicus* Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 626). Gender : masculine.

Lupa Leach, 1814, Brewster's *Edinb. Encycl.* **7** : 390 (type species, by monotypy : *Cancer pelagicus* Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 626). Gender : feminine.

Macropipus Prestandrea, 1833, *Effem. sci. lett. Sicilia* **6** : 5 (type species, by monotypy : *Portunus macropipus* Prestandrea, 1833, *Effem. sci. lett. Sicilia* **6** : 4 (=*Portunus tuberculatus* P. Roux, 1828, *Crust. Médit.* : pl. 32 figs. 1-5). Gender : masculine.

Neptunus De Haan, 1838, Siebold's *Fauna japon.*, Crust. (1) : 3, 7 (type species, by selection by Miers, 1886 (*Rep. Voy. Challenger*, Zool. **17** : 172) : *Cancer pelagicus* Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 626). Gender : masculine.

Liocarcinus Stimpson, 1870, *Bull. Mus. comp. Zool.* **2** : 146 (type species, by monotypy : *Portunus holsatus* Fabricius, 1798, *Suppl. Ent. syst.* : 366). Gender : masculine.

3. Before starting the discussion of the question to which genus the generic name *Portunus* should be applied, it seems desirable to ascertain whether Weber, 1795, or Fabricius, 1798, should be cited as its author. Generally, the generic name is given as *Portunus* Fabricius, 1798, and under the unrevised *Règles* this practice was entirely correct. The generic name *Portunus* Weber, 1795, under the unrevised *Règles* was invalid, since Weber in his 1795 publication under the name *Portunus* only mentioned the trivial names of a number of species, without giving a definition or a description of the genus and without designating or indicating a type species. During the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology held in Paris in 1948, however, it was decided that a generic name published before 1st January, 1931, should be available as from the date of its original publication not only when it was then accompanied by a definition or description or when a type species was designated or indicated, but also when the name, on being first published, was accompanied by no verbal definition or description, the only indication given being that provided by the citation under the generic name concerned of the names of one or more previously published nominal species (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 80). On account of this decision *Portunus* Weber, 1795, became a valid generic name, while the name *Portunus* Fabricius, 1798, became invalid, being a junior homonym of Weber's *Portunus.* Since both *Portunus* Weber and *Portunus* Fabricius have the same type species, they are not only homonyms, but also objective synonyms of one another. For the present purposes, it is relatively immaterial which of these two names should be accepted in preference to the other.

4. The crucial point of the question dealt with in the present proposal is the fact that most American authors adopt a different species as the type species of the genus *Portunus* from that accepted by most European authors. For convenience's sake these two viewpoints, the American and the European respectively, are tabulated below, the two genera in question being indicated as " A " and " B ".

	American viewpoint	European viewpoint
Genus " A " ..	*Portunus* Weber, 1795 type species : *Cancer pelagicus* Linnaeus, 1758	*Neptunus* De Haan, 1833 type species : *Cancer pelagicus* Linnaeus, 1758
Genus " B " ..	*Liocarcinus* Stimpson, 1870 type species : *Portunus holsatus* Fabricius, 1798	*Portunus* Fabricius, 1798 type species : *Cancer puber* Linnaeus, 1758

5. Both under the revised and under the unrevised *Règles* the European view point is definitely incorrect. The only species ever selected as the type species of the genus *Portunus* Weber, is *Cancer pelagicus* Linnaeus. For *Portunus* Fabricius more than one species has been cited as the type species, but here too the first validly selected type species is *Cancer pelagicus* Linnaeus, which was so selected by Latreille (1810). As far as I can ascertain, the first type selection for *Portunus* Fabricius in the sense adopted by European authors is that by H. Milne Edwards, 1837 (Cuvier's *Règne anim.* (Ed. 4) (Disciple's Ed.) **18** : pl. 10, fig. 2), who cited *Cancer puber* Linnaeus, 1758 as type species of *Portunus* Fabricius. Several European authors have tried to prove that Latreille's (1810) type selections are invalid, but this question has now been definitely settled by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, who in its *Opinion* 11 (1910, Smithson. Publ. **1938** : 17–18, and 1945, *Opin. Decl. Int. Comm. Zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 179–190) and in the amplification of that *Opinion*, published as *Opinion* 136 in 1939 (*ibid.* **2** : 13–20) expressly stated that Latreille's (1810) type selections should be accepted. The European viewpoint thus is definitely contrary to the *Règles* and it can be accepted only under suspension of the *Règles*.

6. The next question is whether or not a suspension of the *Règles* is justified in the present case, or in other words whether or not the strict application of the *Règles* will cause such serious great confusion that it should be prevented by a suspension of those *Règles*. This question is here first considered for the genera A and B (see above table) separately.

7. Genus " A." This genus consists of a considerable number of species of, often large, swimming crabs, which inhabit the tropical and sub-tropical seas of the world and in various regions serve for food (East Africa, India, Indonesia, Australia, Japan, Hawaii). In American literature at present the name *Portunus* has been universally adopted for this genus, e.g. in M. J. Rathbun's (1930, *Bull. U.S. nat. Mus.* **152**) important monograph of the Cancroid crabs of America. In West Africa the genus is rather rare and the references in West African literature are consequently few. Rathbun (1900, *Proc. U.S. nat. Mus.* **22** : 289) in her list of the Decapoda of West Africa used the generic name *Portunus* for it, but European authors like Balss (1921, Mechaelsen's *Beitr. Kenntn. Meeresf. Westafr.* **3** (2)), who later revised the West African Decapods, employed the name *Neptunus* De Haan. The latter name has been given to the genus by the majority of the authors writing on indo-westpacific crabs ; the Australian and Hawaiian authors, however, use the name *Portunus*, just as does the Siamese author Suvatti in his check list of the fauna of Thailand, and Miss Rathbun in her papers on indo-westpacific crabs. The Chinese author Shen (1932, *Zool. sin.* (A) **9** (1)) in his monograph of the crabs of North China used the generic name *Portunus* for the present genus, but in later papers he employed the name *Neptunus*. The name *Neptunus* also is generally employed for the species of this genus living in the Mediterranean. Barnard (1950, *Ann. S. Afr. Mus.* **38** : 152) in his monograph of the South African Decapoda employs the name *Lupa* Leach for the present genus.

8. Summarizing, we see that for the genus "A" the name *Portunus* has been practically universally adopted in the literature concerning American, Hawaiian and Australian crabs, while in the carcinological literature concerning the rest of the indo-westpacific region it is the name *Neptunus* that is generally employed. Also in the scanty literature concerning the European and West African species of the genus, the name *Neptunus* is usually adopted.

9. A suspension of the *Règles* which would make it possible to use the generic name *Portunus* for genus " B," as is advocated by most European authors, would result in an enormous confusion as regards the name for genus

" A." The valid name for genus "A" in that case would be *Lupa* Leach, 1814, since this name is an older objective synonym of *Neptunus* De Haan, 1833. If the *Règles* were to be suspended in the foregoing sense, the name for genus "A" would have to be changed not only in the American literature, but also in the indo-westpacific literature. A strict application of the *Règles*, however, would leave unchanged the name at present used for the present genus in American (and Australian and Hawaiian) literature. In my opinion a strict application of the *Règles* is greatly to be preferred to a suspension in the case of genus " A."

10. Genus " B." About ten species of this genus are known, all of them inhabiting European seas; the genus is known from Scandinavia to the Mediterranean and the Black Sea, and from West Africa. One of the species has been reported several times from the indo-westpacific area (Red Sea, Australia, New Zealand, Japan). The animals are rather small compared to those of genus "A" and are of very little economic importance, though some are eaten.

11. When discussing the present question Miss Rathbun (1897, *Proc. biol. Soc. Wash.* **11** : 155) assumed that the correct name for genus " B " was *Liocarcinus* Stimpson, 1870, and not *Portunus* Fabricius. At that time the latter name was generally used for it, and at present it still is commonly adopted by most authors. The name *Liocarcinus* has almost exclusively been used by American authors, but since the genus does not occur in American waters, Stimpson's generic name is seldom found in the literature. Though the species of this genus are rather few in number and are of very little economic importance, while furthermore they are practically never used as laboratory animals, they are very abundant along the larger part of the European coasts and therefore are dealt with in numerous popular books and textbooks. Consequently a strict application of the *Règles* in the case of genus " B " would cause a great confusion, which may be prevented by suspension of these *Règles*.

12. It is clear that whatever decision is taken in the present question, the change of several well known names is necessary before final uniformity is attained. A suspension of the *Règles* to retain the name *Portunus* for the genus " B " would cause the change of the generally adopted name for genus "A" in American literature, while it would not prevent the change of the currently employed name for that genus in the larger part of the indo-westpacific literature. Even a double suspension of the *Règles* (one to make *Portunus* the valid name for genus " B " and one to let *Neptunus* be the valid name for genus "A") would still necessitate the change of name for genus "A" in American, Australian and Hawaiian literature.

13. As a Dutch carcinologist, I should be opposed to the name *Portunus*, which has always been employed for the common swimming crabs of the shores of my country, being changed to a name which is quite unfamiliar to me, and I am certain that most other European carcinologists would feel the same way. But when we look at the question as a whole, the reasons for retaining the name *Portunus* for genus " B " become much less evident. First, because it is not only genus " B " which is involved in this question, but also genus " A," the nomenclature of which would be more greatly upset by the suspension of the *Règles* than by the strict application of them. Second, the number of species of genus "A" is much larger than that of genus " B " (the latter contains about 10 species in all, while of the former not less than 24 species have been reported from American waters alone). Third, the nomenclature of the American crabs has been more or less stabilized by the careful work of Miss Rathbun, and a change in it is the more undesirable, in that this nomenclature (which strictly adheres to the *Règles*) is employed in Miss Rathbun's splendid monographs of the American crabs, which are the standard works consulted by anyone interested in these animals. The nomenclature of the European crabs on the contrary, is still very unsettled, probably because of lack of interest in nomenclatorial problems by European carcinologists. Furthermore, there exists for the European crabs at the present time no monograph comparable to Miss Rathbun's works.

14. Considering all sides of the present question, I can see no sufficient reason to ask for a suspension of the *Règles*. The consistent application of the *Règles* in this case seems to be the safest way out of the muddle in which we find ourselves at the present time. I realize that there will be considerable opposition to this solution, especially from European carcinologists, but they should remember that the intolerable situation which exists at present is mainly due to us, European carcinologists, ourselves. Had the European workers immediately adopted Miss Rathbun's solution, no trouble and confusion would have existed at this moment. Had they tried to get a suspension of the *Règles* in the early times, when the American point of view had not yet become so deeply rooted, their viewpoint might have been legalized. But no action whatever was undertaken and the incorrect nomenclature was stubbornly used. Palmer, 1927 (*J. mar. biol. Ass. U. K.* (n. ser.) **14** : 881), it is true, pointed out the desirability of having the *Règles* suspended for the generic name *Portunus*, but no proposal to that end was, I am informed, ever received by the International Commission.

15. The last point which I want to discuss here is, what generic name should be given to genus " B," when the name *Portunus* is not available for it. Miss Rathbun (1897, *Proc. biol. Soc. Wash.* **11** : 155) suggested the generic name *Liocarcinus* Stimpson, 1870. This name was given by Stimpson to a certain group of crabs that at present are considered to belong in genus " B." A recent examination of a paper by Prestandrea (1833, *Effem. sci. lett. Sicilia* **6** : 3-14) showed me that this author proposed a new generic name *Macropipus* for a species of swimming crab to which in the same paper he gave the names *Portunus macropipus* and *Macropipus citrinus*. This species without any doubt is identical with *Portunus tuberculatus* P. Roux, a crab belonging in genus " B." Since Prestandrea's generic name *Macropipus* is much older than the name *Liocarcinus* Stimpson, it has priority. The name *Liocarcinus*, as pointed out above, has seldom been used for the genus concerned, and therefore its replacement by the name *Macropipus* will cause no difficulties.

16. The concrete proposal which I accordingly submit is that the International Commission should :—

(1) place on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* the undermentioned generic names :—

  (*a*) the name *Portunus* Weber, 1795 (gender of generic name: masculine) (type species, by selection by Rathbun (1926): *Cancer pelagicus* Linnaeus, 1758) ;

  (*b*) the name *Macropipus* Prestandrea, 1833 (gender of generic name: masculine) (type species, by monotypy: *Portunus macropipus* Prestandrea, 1833) ;

(2) place on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* the undermentioned generic names :—

  (*a*) the name *Portunus* Fabricius, 1798 (a junior homonym, and objective synonym, of *Portunus* Weber, 1795) ;

  (*b*) the name *Lupa* Leach, 1814 (an objective junior synonym of *Portunus* Weber, 1795) ;

  (*c*) the name *Neptunus* De Haan, 1833 (an objective junior synonym of *Portunus* Weber, 1795) ;

(3) place on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* the undermentioned valid trivial names :—

  (*a*) the name *pelagicus* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Cancer pelagicus* (trivial name of type species of *Portunus* Weber, 1795) ;

  (*b*) the name *tuberculatus* P. Roux, 1828 (as published in the binominal combination *Portunus tuberculatus*).

SUPPORT FOR DR. L. B. HOLTHUIS' PROPOSALS RELATING TO THE GENERIC NAME "PORTUNUS" WEBER, 1795 (CLASS CRUSTACEA, ORDER DECAPODA)

By FENNER A. CHACE, Jr.

(*Smithsonian Institution, U.S. National Museum, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)642)

(Letter dated 19th September 1952)

Dr. Holthuis has informed me that you would like to have my comments on his proposal to the International Commission on the use of the generic name *Portunus* Weber, 1795. I am in complete agreement with this proposal as phrased by Dr. Holthuis, and I am fairly certain that all other American crab specialists would react similarly. The decision recommended in this proposal is the one which has been accepted by all American workers in recent years as far as I am aware.

PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO VALIDATE THE TRIVIAL NAME "FLAVIPES" OLIVIER, 1795 (AS PUBLISHED IN THE COMBINATION "DYTISCUS FLAVIPES") (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER COLEOPTERA)

By J. BALFOUR-BROWNE, M.A.

(*Department of Entomology, British Museum* (*Natural History*), *London*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)667)

The purpose of the present application is to ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to use its plenary powers to validate the trivial name *flavipes* Olivier, 1795 (as published in the combination *Dytiscus flavipes*) by suppressing the trivial name *flavipes* Fabricius, 1792 (as published in the same combination). The name *flavipes* Olivier is habitually used for the species variously known as *Hydroporus* (*Graptodytes*) *flavipes* or as *Graptodytes flavipes* (according to the view taken as to whether *Graptodytes* Seidlitz, 1887, should be regarded as a full genus or as a subgenus only). The older homonym *flavipes* Fabricius has, on the other hand, never been used by any author since its identity was determined in 1808 by Gyllenhal, who showed that it was an unneeded synonym of a different species (see paragraph 7 below).

2. The species with which the present application is concerned, *Hydroporus* (*Graptodytes*) *flavipes* (Olivier, 1795), has been known by this name, and has been attributed to Olivier, by all authors, except Zaitzev (1907) and Guignot (1947). Six trivial names, three of Stephens and three of Schaufuss, are listed by Zimmermann (1932, *Best.-Tab. eur. Col.* **103** : 8) in the synonymy of this species.

3. Stephens did not mention *flavipes* Olivier, but in 1828 (*Ill. Brit. Ent.*, Mand. **2** : 58) he described a species to which he applied the name *Hydroporus minimus* (Scopoli) i.e. *Dytiscus minimus* Scopoli, 1763 (*Ent. carn* : 98); the description so given applies well to *Dytiscus flavipes* Olivier. It is accepted that the *minimus* of Stephens is not that of Scopoli, which latter is accepted as being identical with *Dytiscus granularis* Linnaeus, 1767. The trivial name *minimus* Stephens, 1828, is not available for *flavipes* Olivier, since it is based upon a misidentification (Article 36).

4. The next name to be considered is *Hydroporus concinnus* Stephens, 1835 (*Ill. Brit. Ent.*, Mand. **5** : 392). This name is treated by most authors as a synonym of *Dytiscus flavipes* Olivier, but the description given by Stephens cannot, in my opinion, apply to that species. Moreover, the size given by Stephens for *concinnus* is too large for *flavipes* Olivier. The Stephens Collection does not contain either the holotype for this species, if there was one, nor does it contain any syntypes, if this species was based upon syntypes only. This species is unrecognisable from the description and the name *Hydroporus concinnus* Stephens must be regarded as a *nomen dubium*.

5. Later in the same volume (**5** : 438) Stephens established another new nominal species, *Hydroporus marmoratus*, which is also normally identified with *Dytiscus flavipes* Olivier. Stephens' description of *marmoratus* could apply to *flavipes*, but the locality given by Stephens for his *marmoratus* lies outside the known area of distribution of *flavipes*. There is today no specimen of *marmoratus* in the Stephens Collection. The name *Hydroporus marmoratus* Stephens, like *Hydroporus concinnus* Stephens, must therefore be regarded as a *nomen dubium*.

6. Zaitzev (1907, *Rev. russ. Ent.* **7** : 118) was the first to point out that the name *Dytiscus flavipes* Olivier 1795 (*Entomologie* **3** (No. 40) : 38, pl. 5, fig. 52a, b) was an invalid junior homonym of *Dytiscus flavipes* Fabricius, 1792 (*Ent. syst.* **1** : 201). He proposed that the trivial name *concinnus* Stephens, 1835, should be brought into use for the species till then known by the name *flavipes* Olivier. This proposal was ignored. In 1947 (*Faun. France* **48** : 122 and footnote) the same proposal was again brought forward by Guignot.

7. The nominal species *Dytiscus flavipes* Fabricius was described as " Habitat in India orientali D. Lund." In 1801 (*Syst. Eleuth.* **1** : 273) Fabricius again mentioned his *flavipes*, giving a reference to his description of this species in the *Ent. syst.* but on this occasion stating that this species occurred " in Daniae paludibus D. Lund." It is now accepted that the locality given by Fabricius in 1792 was a mistake due to a *lapsus calami*. It is agreed also that this species is the same as *Dytiscus planus* Fabricius, 1781 (*Spec. Ins.* **2** : 501) (a species which is currently regarded as belonging to the genus *Hydroporus* Schellenberg, 1806 (s. str.)). The name *flavipes* Fabricius, 1792, is therefore a subjective junior synonym of *planus* Fabricius, 1781. Gyllenhal examined the type specimen of *flavipes* Fabricius, which he considered to be a colour variety of *planus* Fabricius (Gyllenhal, 1808, *Ins. suec.* **1** : 531). The name *flavipes* Fabricius has never appeared in the literature since the publication of Gyllenhal's paper.

8. The trivial name *flavipes* Olivier has been continuously in use for the species concerned ever since its first publication in 1795—a period of over 150 years and is still so used ; the only authors who have rejected this name are Zaitzev (1907) and Guignot (1947), but this action has won no support. On the other hand, the older trivial name *flavipes* Fabricius, through which *flavipes* Olivier is invalidated by homonymy, has not appeared in the literature for over 140 years and, being a junior synonym of *planus* Fabricius, can never be needed. Accordingly, its suppression by the International Commission under its plenary powers could not possibly cause the slightest inconvenience or disturbance, but would on the contrary, be of great value, since, by validating *flavipes* Olivier, it would both promote stability and uniformity and, in addition, prevent the situation of extreme confusion and uncertainty which would otherwise arise owing to the fact that each of the next two possible names (*concinnus* Stephens, 1835, and *marmoratus* Stephens, 1835) is a *nomen dubium* and could never provide a stable name for the present species.

9. The concrete proposals which are accordingly now laid before the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature are that it should :—

(1) use its plenary powers for the purpose of suppressing, for the purposes both of the Law of Priority and of the Law of Homonymy, the trivial name *flavipes* Fabricius, 1792 (as published in the combination *Dytiscus flavipes*) ;

(2) place the trivial name *flavipes* Olivier, 1795 (as published in the combination *Dytiscus flavipes*) on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* :

(3) place the trivial name *flavipes* Fabricius, 1792 (as published in the combination *Dytiscus flavipes*), as proposed, in (1) above, to be suppressed under the plenary powers, on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology.*

PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO SUPPRESS THE GENERIC NAME " ACMEA " HARTMANN, 1821, AND TO VALIDATE THE GENERIC NAMES " ACMAEA " ESCHSCHOLTZ, 1833, AND " TRUNCATELLA " RISSO, 1826 (CLASS GASTROPODA)

By A. MYRA KEEN and SIEMON W. MULLER

(*Stanford University, Stanford, California, U.S.A.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)27)

(Enclosure to a letter dated 1st July 1952)

(For the proposal submitted in this case, see *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **7** : 210-211)

We favor the suppression of *Acmea* Hartmann, 1821, and the retention of *Truncatella* Risso, 1826, and *Acmaea* Eschscholtz, 1833, in conformity with accepted usage.

SUPPORT FOR THE SOLUTION OF THE " ACMEA/ACMAEA " PROBLEM (CLASS GASTROPODA) SUGGESTED BY THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

By AVERY R. TEST

(*Ann Arbor, Michigan, U.S.A.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)27)

(Letter dated 28th August 1952)

In reply to your communication, reference number Z.N.(S.)27, *re* the *Acmaea/Acmea/Acme* problem, I first want to thank you for the opportunity to express my feelings upon it, and then to say that I am very pleased with the recommendation as outlined in the discussion 1950 (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **4** : 389-392), and the later one (1952 *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **7** : 210-211).

I had not realized two well established genera would be benefited by the suppression of Hartmann's name, so am doubly pleased that the recommendation is to suppress the latter, thereby establishing unequivocally Eschscholtz's name *Acmaea* and also another generic name of long usage.

I am sorry my original information concerning Hartmann's names and dates of publication were incorrect, but I was never able to obtain a copy of the publications or even a photostat or photograph of the pages concerned, so had to rely upon secondhand information concerning them.

I would like to congratulate the Commission upon what seems a very sensible recommendation, and hope it soon becomes an *Opinion*.

SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO VALIDATE THE TRIVIAL NAME "ADIPPE" AS PUBLISHED IN THE COMBINATION "PAPILIO ADIPPE" BY DENIS & SCHIFFERMÜLLER IN 1775 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER LEPIDOPTERA)

By B. J. LEMPKE

(*Amsterdam, The Netherlands*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)79)

(Letter dated 28th September 1952)

Thank you very much for the separates that you sent of the papers on the question of the *adippe*-nomenclature recently published in the *Bulletin* (1952, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **6** : 323-336).

I have carefully read the propositions put forward by you and the other authors, and my conclusion is that it would be a very wise deed of the International Commission if it were to accept the steps recommended. It would save a universally known name and make an end to much trouble.

A COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED SOLUTION OF THE "NIOBE/CYDIPPE/ADIPPE" PROBLEM (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER LEPIDOPTERA)

By JIŘÍ PACLT

(*Head of the Department of Biology, Forest Products Research Institute, Bratislava, Czechoslovakia*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)79)

(Enclosure to letter dated 29th September 1952)

In accordance with a demand received from the Secretary of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, I refer to the two proposals relating to the *niobe/cydippe/adippe* problem published in August 1952 (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **6** : 323-336).

The authors of the proposals above mentioned recommend that the trivial name *adippe* [Denis & Schiffermüller], 1775 (as published in the binominal combination *Papilio adippe*) be placed on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology.* This specific trivial name is thus proposed to be validated for the "High Brown Fritillary," a species figured by Esper in 1777, *Die Schmetterlinge in Abbildungen nach der Natur mit Beschreibungen,* **1** (3) : pl. 18, fig. 1.

Recently the problem of the valid name for the "High Brown Fritillary" has been discussed by several authors. Personally, I came to the conclusion that the only valid name for that species is *Brenthis* (subg. *Fabriciana*) *phryxa* (Bergstraesser, [1783]) ; this opinion (published in 1947 in *Miscel. ent.* **44** : 98) has been followed by G. Bernardi, C. Herbulot and J. Picard in their "*Liste des Grypocères et Rhopalocères de la Faune française conforme aux Règles internationales de la Nomenclature*" (1950, *Rev. franc. Lépid.* **12** : 332) as well as by R. Schwarz in his standard work on the Lepidoptera of Czechoslovakia (for further details see F. Bryk, 1950, *Ent. Tidskr.* **71** : 60-62). Now, at the time of writing this comment I see no reason to change my original opinion.

Owing to the absolutely confused use of the names *adippe* and *cydippe* both in the past and modern literature I think it would be appropriate to abandon every attempt to save at any price a name which never had been used universally, i.e. *adippe.*

SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO VALIDATE THE TRIVIAL NAME "ADIPPE" AS PUBLISHED IN THE COMBINATION "PAPILIO ADIPPE" BY DENIS& SCHIFFERMÜLLER IN 1775 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER LEPIDOPTERA)

By FELIX BRYK

(*Naturhistoriska Riksmuseum, Stockholm, Sweden*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)79)

(Enclosure to letter dated 30th September 1952)

(For application, see 1952, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **6** : 323-336)

Es gereicht mir zur besonderen Ehre Ihrem Wunsche entgegenzukommen, indem ich zur von A. B. Klots und Cyril dos Passos vorgeschlagenen Beibehaltung des Tagfalternamens *Argynnis adippe* (L.) Stellung nehme.

Obwohl ich mir dessen bewusst bin, dass eine Durchschneidung von gordischem Knoten zur Lösung einer strittigen Frage in der Wissenschaft absolut zu verwerfen ist, dass sohin jener Vorschlag bei eventueller Annahme zu einen Machtspruche fürhen würde da Linne's *Papilio adippe* (1767) ein ganz anderes Tier ist, wie das, welches es heute vorstellen soll, so kann ich trotzdem nicht umhin, mich restlos dem Vorschlage der beiden Herren Klots und dos Passos anzuschliessen.

Begründung : Der Synonymenkomplex für *cydippe-adippe* stellt einen derartigen komplizierten Rattenschwanz von Verworrenem, Labilem, Zweifelhaftem und Unsicherem dar, dass bei eventueller Wahl eines anderen existierenden Namens letzten Endes nur rechthaberische Dialektik den nomenklatorischen Zwist entscheiden könnte. Ich selbst habe in einem Artikel " Warum muss der Linnesche Name für die schwedische ' Cydippe ' fallen ? " (1950, *Ent. Tidskr.* **71** : 60-62) skeptisch gefragt, " ob nicht wieder ein anderer Revisionist einen anderen und noch älteren " (Namen als *phryxa* (Bergstr.)) aus dem Kehrichthaufen abgelegter Synonyme ausgraben wird.

Zum Schlusse möchte ich noch auf die unrichtige Bildung des Namens " Adippe " hinweisen. John L. Heller hat in 1945, *Trans. of the American Philol. Association.* **86** : 354 (Fussnote 54) über diesen Namen geschrieben : " No such mythological name is known to me. It is probably an arbitrary variant for Cydippe."

SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS IN CONNECTION WITH THE TRIVIAL NAME "ADIPPE," AS PUBLISHED BY DENIS & SCHIFFERMÜLLER IN 1775 IN THE COMBINATION "PAPILIO ADIPPE" (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER LEPIDOPTERA)

By B. C. S. WARREN

(*Folkestone, England*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)79)

(Letter dated 3rd October 1952)

Many thanks for your separate on the *adippe* question (1952, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **6** : 323-336). I need scarcely say that I am very pleased both that the matter has been taken so far, and at the way in which you suggest dealing with it. The request, as set out in paragraph 9 of your paper in the *Bulletin*, seems to me not only satisfactory but also the only possible way of dealing with the matter.

SUPPORT FOR THE ACTION PROPOSED IN REGARD TO THE NAMES INVOLVED IN THE "NIOBE/ADIPPE" COMPLEX (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER LEPIDOPTERA)

By WM. T. M. FORBES

(*Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)79)

(Letter dated 7th October 1952)

I have received from Mr. C. F. dos Passos the double paper on *niobe/adippe* etc., which you wrote me about, a short time ago (*Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*, vol. 6, pp. 323-336).

It is really needless for me to remind you that my opinion is based not on the Code as such, but on what I consider the proper and useful result ; rather than, the machinery by which it is arrived at.

I think the proposed ruling would have completely the proper result.

I notice this is one of the rare cases where the " W.V." has really at least a rudimentary description of the species concerned, even though it comes in the form of a footnote on another species.

I question the advisability of establishing the species from one author, but citing a figure by another. At least I think there should be a *clear* indication in the *Opinion* that these two citations actually were by persons in close touch with each other, and may be presumed based on the same material.

I feel that in the presentation the genus name should be the sound and familiar genus, rather than a rather obscure splinter-genus, really representing only a fairly tangible species group.

I note that in the 1758 *Systema* Linnaeus undoubtedly included both forms, not merely the unsilvered one, for he writes not " pallido maculatis " as later, but " argenteis obsoletis," and again " maculis argenteis " even though it is only " posticarum 7 marginalibus," indicating much more silver than his later description.

In item (7) I view the word " unfortunately " as unfortunate. One must remember that at that time the Code was followed by very few zoologists, that there was no efficient means of establishing a " nomen conservandum," and that practically all good zoologists considered that where the use of the rules would have an unfortunate result on a well established name it should be ignored pending revision of the machinery, if not the rules themselves. The action of Verity was not " unfortunate " but would have been almost unanimously viewed as highly proper ; as I notice it would be even now by a recent writer in " Nature."

I consider two types of double-naming should be sharply separated ; and the word " confusion " used only of a shift (one name for two species), not for plain cases of two names for one species ; so I cannot accept the word " confusion " as applying to Poda's *berecynthia*, which after all has never been used effectively for but one species.

COMMENT ON THE ACTION PROPOSED IN RELATION TO THE TRIVIAL NAMES INVOLVED IN THE "NIOBE/CYDIPPE/ADIPPE" COMPLEX (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER LEPIDOPTERA)

By F. MARTIN BROWN

(*Colorado Springs, Colarodo, U.S.A.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)79)

(Letter dated 11th October 1952)

Mr. C. F. dos Passos recently sent to me copies of the papers devoted to Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)79 (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, vol. 6, pp. 323-336). I am not familiar enough with the insects in question to voice a valid opinion in this case. A careful reading of the arguments impresses upon me the complexity of the problem. As I understand it this is the problem :

1758, Linnaeus called the " Swedish Fritillary " *niobe ;*

1761, Linnaeus called the silvered form of the " Swedish Fritillary " *cydippe ;*

1767, Linnaeus renamed the silvered form of the " Swedish Fritillary " *adippe ;* and re-applied *cydippe* to an Oriental Cethosiid.

adippe has generally been applied to the " High Brown Fritillary " in error.

Verity's stand that *adippe* Linnaeus, 1767, does not invalidate *adippe* Denis & Schiffermueller, 1775, is invalid because Linnaeus did not recognise *adippe* as an infra-subspecific variant.

So far as alternate names for the " High Brown Fritillary " are concerned, *berecynthia* Poda, 1791, cannot be recognised with certainty ; *syrinx* Borkhausen, 1788, is an abnormal form figured by Esper ; *esperi* Verity, 1913, was applied to the normal form figured by Esper ; *phryxa* Bergstrasser, 1783, may in part represent *niobe* and in part the " High Brown Fritillary."

As I see it there are two possibilities that there is a valid name for the " High Brown Fritillary "—*phryxa* Bergstrasser, 1783, and *syrinx* Borkhausen, 1788. My personal reaction would be to concentrate upon the identity of these. I should think that the opinions of recognised authorities might settle the question of what species is intended by Bergstrasser on Pl. 82, figs. 1, 2, 3. If these gentlemen consider that none of the three figures represents the " High Brown Fritillary " then the name should be rejected for that species, but only then.

If *phryxa* is rejected then it must be decided that *syrinx* Borkhausen applies to the " High Brown Fritillary " since it is the earliest name that can be recognised as applying to the species—even though the type figure is of an aberrant specimen. The name *syrinx* was published as a binomial. It thus has the status, for nomenclatorial purposes, of a specific name.

While I am in agreement with the idea behind the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* I am not in agreement with the use of the plenary powers for this valuable implement except as a last resource. That the use of *syrinx* Borkhausen may cause some to be disgruntled should not be considered. We are trying to establish a nomenclatorial system for all time and to do so must be disturbing to some one at each change toward stability. Certainly many of us in America regretted to see some of our " old names " disappear—in *Boloria* for instance—but we are managing to survive. Unless the thesis of priority is eliminated entirely from the *Règles* I believe every effort must be made to support it.

SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS FOR VALIDATING THE TRIVIAL NAME "ADIPPE," AS PUBLISHED IN THE COMBINATION "PAPILIO ADIPPE" IN THE VIENNA CATALOGUE OF 1775 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER LEPIDOPTERA)

By HENRY BEURET
(*Neuewelt, Basle, Switzerland*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)79)

(Letter dated 12th October 1952)

Je vous remercie cordialement de votre lettre du 20 écoulé accompagnée des pages 323-336 du *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*, Vol. 6 (August, 1952).

Entre-temps, j'ai examiné ce cas en consultant les description orginales et les figures citées dans le dit *Bulletin*.

Réflexions faites, je crois que l'on doit accepter les propositions que vous avez exposées aux pages 334-336. Si l'on veut conserver le nom "adippe," ce qui me semble désirable, il n'est pas possible de trouver une autre solution. D'autre part, celle que vous proposez a l'avantage de règler aussi une fois pour toutes le cas de *Cethosia cydippe* L., 1767.

J'ai examiné surtout aussi *phryxa* Bergstrasser. Contrairement à l'opinion de Mr. Verity je ne crois pas que l'on puisse dire avec certitude que les figs. 1 et 2, pl. 82 de Bergstrasser représentent le High Brown Fritillary ! C'est une raison de plus qui m'engage à recommander l'acceptation de votre solution soit *adippe* Schiffermüller et Denis.

Je vois que vous dites *adippe* "Schiffermüller et Denis" puis *adippe* "Denis et Schiffermüller." Cela arrive aussi chez d'autre auteurs. Personellement j'avais jusqu'ici cité seulement "Schiffermüller."

N'y aurait-il pas lieu de recommander que l'on cite dorénavant "Schiffermüller et Denis" soit *Schiffermüller en premier lieu* et *Denis ensuite ?* Je crois qu'il n'y a pas de doute que Schiffermüller était le plus important des deux auteurs viennois ; on n'a qu'à consulter certains auteurs de la fin du 18 ème siècle et du début du 19 ème siècle pour s'en rendre compte. Il me parait donc logique que Schiffermüller ait la première place. Qu'en dites vous ?

ON THE AUTHORSHIP TO BE ATTRIBUTED TO THE ANONYMOUS WORK PUBLISHED IN VIENNA IN 1775 UNDER THE TITLE "ANKÜNDUNG EINES SYSTEMATISCHEN WERKES VON DEN SCHMETTERLINGEN DER WIENER GEGEND"

By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.
(*London*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)79)

In his letter of 12th October 1952 supporting the proposed use of the plenary powers to validate the trivial name *adippe* as published in the combination *Papilio adippe* in the anonymous work published in Vienna in 1775 under the title *Ankündung eines systematischen Werkes von den Schmetterlingen der Wiener Gegend* M. Henry Beuret raised the question why, in the application in regard to the foregoing case submitted jointly by Mr. N. D. Riley, Dr. Roger Verity and myself, new names published in the foregoing work were attributed to "Denis & Schiffermüller" and not, as is more commonly done, to "Schiffermüller & Denis."

We considered this question when we were preparing our application to the Commission, and it seemed to us that in a formal document of this kind it would be better if we were to follow the accepted convention for the citation of the names of the authors of a book published anonymously, that is, to cite those names in alphabetical order. Sometimes, as here, the adoption of this convention has the result that it gives the first place to the less important of the authors concerned. It has however the advantage that it provides a standard method for the citation of the names of authors of anonymous books that would otherwise be unattainable.

SUPPORT FOR THE ACTION PROPOSED IN REGARD TO THE TRIVIAL NAMES INVOLVED IN THE "NIOBE/CYDIPPE/ADIPPE" COMPLEX (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER LEPIDOPTERA)

By ERNEST L. BELL
(*Flushing, N.Y., U.S.A.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)79)

(Letter dated 14th October 1952)

I have just received from Mr. Cyril F. dos Passos, separates of his joint paper (with Klots and Grey) and your joint paper (with Riley and Verity) on the *niobe-cydippe-adippe* problem and the suggested solution of it (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, vol. 6, pp. 323-336, 1952).

Mr. dos Passos has suggested to me that you would like to have my reaction to the proposed solution of this problem ; thus I am writing to say that I am in full agreement with and heartily endorse the procedure proposed to the International Commission as expressed in the papers referred to above.

SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO VALIDATE THE TRIVIAL NAME "ADIPPE" (AS PUBLISHED IN THE COMBINATION "PAPILIO ADIPPE") AS FROM DENIS & SCHIFFERMÜLLER, 1775 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER LEPIDOPTERA)

By EUGENE MUNROE
(*Department of Agriculture, Division of Entomology, Ottawa, Canada*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)79)

(Letter dated 15th October 1952)

I have recently received from Mr. C. F. dos Passos of Mendham, N.J., a reprint of pp. 323-336 of *Bull. zool. Nomenclature*, vol. 6, in which are set forth parallel proposals by Grey, Klots and dos Passos, and by Hemming, Riley and Verity with respect to the trivial name of the "High Brown Fritillary."

Mr. dos Passos has asked me to express my opinion to the Commission as to the merits of the proposals outlined in these two submissions. I am happy to say that I am in complete accord with them.

SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO VALIDATE THE TRIVIAL NAME "ADIPPE" AS PUBLISHED IN THE COMBINATION "PAPILIO ADIPPE" BY DENIS & SCHIFFERMULLER IN 1775 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER LEPIDOPTERA)

By ELLI FRANZ
(*Senckenbergische Naturforschende Gesellschaft, Frankfurt a.M., Germany*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)79)

(Letter dated 22nd October 1952)

(For application, see 1952, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 6 : 323-336)

In Beantwortung Ihres Briefes von 20.9.52 teile ich Ihnen mit, dass auch ich *Argynnis adippe* als *gültigen* Namen vorschlage.

SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO VALIDATE THE TRIVIAL NAME "ADIPPE," AS PUBLISHED IN THE COMBINATION "PAPILIO ADIPPE" BY DENIS & SCHIFFERMÜLLER IN 1775 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER LEPIDOPTERA)

By ERNST MAYR

(*The American Museum of Natural History, New York*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)79)

(Letter dated 22nd October 1952)

I have been requested by Mr. C. F. dos Passos to " express my reaction to the application " relating to the *adippe* problem submitted under the reference number Z.N.(S.)79.

After a careful study of *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, vol. 6, pp. 323-336 I conclude that the petition will permit the best possible solution of this nomenclatorial tangle. The proposed solution will cause the least disturbance of the existing nomenclature, and this is clearly a case where the International Commission should use its Plenary Powers.

SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO VALIDATE THE TRIVIAL NAME "ADIPPE" (AS PUBLISHED IN THE COMBINATION "PAPILIO ADIPPE") AS FROM DENIS & SCHIFFERMÜLLER, 1775 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER LEPIDOPTERA)

By KARL P. SCHMIDT

(*Chicago Natural History Museum, Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)79)

(Letter dated 5th November 1952)

(For application, see 1952, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 6 : 323-336)

With reference to the two applications to the Commission regarding the trivial names *niobe*, *cydippe*, and *adippe*, I wish to support the solution of Messrs. Grey, Klots, and Dos Passos (Commission's Reference Z.N.(S.)79).

SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSALS RELATING TO THE TRIVIAL NAMES INVOLVED IN THE "NIOBE/CYDIPPE/ADIPPE" COMPLEX AND TO THE TRIVIAL NAME "PLEXIPPUS" LINNAEUS, 1758 (AS PUBLISHED IN THE COMBINATION "PAPILIO PLEXIPPUS" (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER LEPIDOPTERA)

By BRYANT MATHER

(*Jackson, Mississippi, U.S.A.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)79 (" adipe ") and Z.N.(S.)323 (" plexippus "))

(Letter dated 13th October 1952)

Through the kindness of Mr. Cyril F. dos Passos I have received copies of reprints of three papers from vol. 6 of the *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* relating to the *niobe/cydippe/adippe* problem (pp. 323-356) and to *Papilio plexippus* (pp. 278-283) (Commission's references Z.N.(S.)79 and 323).

It is my view that the recommendations contained in these papers are reasonable and, in the absence of compelling arguments to the contrary of which I have no knowledge, merit acceptance. I have no personal prior information on the *niobe/cydippe/adippe* problem, hence my opinion is based entirely on the statements contained in the two papers dealing with it. In the case of the use of the name *plexippus* for the North American " Monarch " my views are based on my personal familiarity with the insect itself, my desire to see the nomenclature stabilised, study of the papers that appeared in *Science* in 1951, and the statements in the reprint of the paper by Mr. dos Passos. I have before me three of the six figures offered for the Commission's choice by Mr. dos Passos. Those included in the works by Klots and Clark have the advantage of giving the locality from which the figured specimen came (Scranton, Pa., and Kendall, N.Y., respectively) while that in the work by Lutz has the advantage of being in color. It is therefore my feeling, as it apparently is that of Mr. dos Passos, that, if it is deemed advisable to refer to a figure, it is relatively immaterial which one of those suggested is cited —with the possible exception of that in the work by Catesby—for the reason stated by Mr. dos Passos.

SUPPORT FOR THE ACTION PROPOSED IN REGARD TO THE TRIVIAL NAMES INVOLVED IN THE " NIOBE/CYDIPPE/ADIPPE " COMPLEX AND IN REGARD TO THE TRIVIAL NAME " PLEXIPPUS " LINNAEUS, 1758 (AS PUBLISHED IN THE COMBINATION " PAPILIO PLEXIPPUS ") (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER LEPIDOPTERA)

By T. N. FREEMAN

(*Department of Agriculture, Division of Entomology, Ottawa, Canada*)

(Commission's references Z.N.(S.)79 (" adippe ") and Z.N.(S.)323 (" plexippus "))

(Letter dated 16th October 1952)

(For the applications concerned, see 1952. *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 6 : 323-336 and 278-283 respectively)

I am in receipt of two letters from Mr. Cyril F. dos Passos of Mendham, N.J., who asked me if I would comment on his article in the *Bull. Zool. Nomenclature* which deals with the reconsideration of the case of *Papilio plexippus* Linn. (Z.N.(S.)323), and also one with the Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)79, which deals with two papers, one by Grey, Klots and dos Passos on the *niobe-cydippe-adippe* problem.

With regard to the *adippe* problem, I must say that I am in complete accord with the views and facts as outlined by Grey, Klots and dos Passos. I am also in accord with his views as outlined in his article on the *plexippus* problem with the exception that the suggestions would only solve the problem temporarily as outlined by Dr. Munroe of this Unit in his recent letter dated 15th October, 1952.

SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY MR. C. F. DOS PASSOS IN RELATION TO THE TRIVIAL NAME "PLEXIPPUS" LINNAEUS, 1758, AS PUBLISHED IN THE COMBINATION "PAPILIO PLEXIPPUS" (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER LEPIDOPTERA)

By F. MARTIN BROWN
(*Colorado Springs, Colorado, U.S.A.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)323)
(Letter dated 11th October 1952)

In connection with a brief study of the "Monarch" butterfly as it appears in Australia I am still in a quandary as to its trivial name. The Commission's agreement at Paris allows two interpretations :

(a) The trivial name *plexippus* Linnaeus is to be applied to the species represented by Holland on plate 7, figure 1 of the Butterfly Book, 1931 edition.
(b) The trivial name *plexippus* Linnaeus is to be applied to the subspecies represented by the above quoted figure.

My personal reaction to the agreement was the broad interpretation suggested in (a) above. Since then numbers of taxonomists have shown that they choose to apply the restricted interpretation in (b) above.

I believe that the intention of the Commission was to consider *plexippus* Linnaeus reserved for the northern migratory race of the species, not the non-migratory tropic race usually called *menippe* Huebner. If my interpretation of the Commission's actions is correct I wish to add my plea to that of Mr. Cyril F. dos Passos (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 6 : 278-283, 1952) (Commission's reference Z.N.(S.) 323).

Mr. dos Passos' recommendation will make the situation clear that *plexippus* Linnaeus is to be used for the migratory Monarch butterfly of North America.

I have always read Linnaeus, 1758, with this in mind : that the material printed in italics is supplementary and often added notes ; that the true description is that printed in Roman type. The original description (p. 471, No. 80) then applies to the American species. The problem of whether or not Linnaeus had seen the American species before writing his 1758 description might be solved if it can be determined when he received Peter Kalm's collection. This was made in 1747 in ample time to have been seen by Linnaeus before writing description No. 80. I am inclined to believe that he had seen Kalm's material before he saw Osbeck's collected in 1750 in China. The 1758 description is likely made from Kalms' specimen later added to (in italics) from Osbeck's.

COMMENT ON MR. C. F. DOS PASSOS' PROPOSAL RELATING TO THE TRIVIAL NAME "PLEXIPPUS" LINNAEUS, 1758, AS PUBLISHED IN THE COMBINATION "PAPILIO PLEXIPPUS" (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER LEPIDOPTERA)

By EUGENE MUNROE
(*Department of Agriculture, Division of Entomology, Ottawa, Canada*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)323)
(Letter dated 15th October 1952)

I have recently received from Mr. C. F. dos Passos of Mendham, N.J., a reprint of pp. 278-283 of *Bull. zool. Nomenclature*, vol. 6, in which he proposes that the Commission modify its 1948 decision as to the application of the name *Papilio plexippus* Linnaeus so as to delete reference to "the American species figured as *Danais plexippus* by Holland (W. J.), 1931, *Butterfly Book* as figure 1 on plate 7," substituting the words "the North American 'Monarch' butterfly."

Although I am in agreement with the proposed action as a palliative measure, I do not think it strikes at the root of the problem.

Since I believe that the practice of designating the application of scientific names by reference either to vernacular names or to figures of specimens that have no status or ambiguous status as types is fundamentally wrong and is at variance with the whole type concept, I can give only qualified approval to Mr. dos Passos' proposal, which I could support only as a temporary measure to remove an existing positive evil.

I wish further to draw attention to the extremely sweeping nature of the principle expressed in Paragraph 20 of Mr. dos Passos' submission. In that paragraph Mr. dos Passos appears to claim that, because the decision to approve lectotypes was not taken until 1948, lectotype designations made prior to that time have no standing.

I do not believe that this principle is implicit in the decision of the Commission recognising lectotypes. Indeed, two considerations argue the reverse :

(a) The fact that parallel provisions for the selection of types of genera (Article 30) in the absence of an original designation have always been taken to be retroactive.

(b) The wording of the definition of lectotype (*Bull. zool. Nomenclature*, 4 : 186) is such as to include any published selection of a single type specimen from a series of syntypes subsequent to the original validation of the respective name.

If, however, I am wrong and Mr. dos Passos' contention is correct, it will automatically mean that almost all of the large number of " lectotypes " at present designated in literature and collections are from the standpoint of the rules spurious, and that a very large source of taxonomic confusion would be created.

It is with regret that I find myself unable to stand fully behind Mr. dos Passos' proposed solution to the *Papilio plexippus* problem, as there are already more than enough disagreements in the field of nomenclature.

SUPPORT FOR MR. C. F. DOS PASSOS' PROPOSALS RELATING TO THE TRIVIAL NAME " PLEXIPPUS " LINNAEUS, 1758, AS PUBLISHED IN THE COMBINATION " PAPILIO PLEXIPPUS " (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER LEPIDOPTERA)

By L. P. GREY

(*Lincoln, Maine, U.S.A.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)323)

(Letter dated 31st October 1952)

I have read the application which Mr. Dos Passos has filed with the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature (1952, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **6** : 278-283) to correct an error made at the Congress in Paris, 1948, in its decision regarding *Papilio plexippus* Linn., the object of Mr. Dos Passos' application being for the Commission to use their plenary powers to fix the name *plexippus* as applying to the *North* American Monarch butterfly.

Inasmuch as the 1948 decision seems to apply inadvertently to a *South* American butterfly, contrary to most popular usage, and since this decision if left unmodified threatens to perpetuate a nomenclatorial situation which is opposed by many workers, I am pleased to learn that the petition mentioned has been filed and wish to state that it has my full support. I hope that the Commission will designate a reference figure from some book readily available to students ; this figure, I should think, ought also to be of a specimen now preserved in some well-known museum.

SUPPORT FOR THE ACTION PROPOSED IN REGARD TO THE TRIVIAL NAME " PLEXIPPUS " LINNAEUS, 1758, AS PUBLISHED IN THE COMBINATION " PAPILIO PLEXIPPUS " (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER LEPIDOPTERA)

By KARL P. SCHMIDT

(*Chicago Natural History Museum, Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)323)

(Letter dated 5th November 1952)

(For application, see 1952, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **6** : 278-283)

In the matter of the name of our common " Monarch " butterfly, I heartily approve the decision of the International Commission to suspend the rules, apply the trivial name *plexippus* to the American species, and place it on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names.*

I wish to support the further suggestion of Mr. Cyril F. Dos Passos (Commission's Reference Z.N.(S.)323) as to amending the Commission's decision with reference to figures to be cited to identify the species properly as the typical *Danaus plexippus plexippus.*

PROPOSED RETENTION OF THE TRIVIAL NAME "DENTATUS" DIESING, 1839 (AS PUBLISHED IN THE COMBINATION "STEPHANURUS DENTATUS") (CLASS NEMATODA)

By ALLEN McINTOSH

(*United States Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Administration, Bureau of Animal Industry, Agricultural Research Center, Beltsville, Maryland, U.S.A.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)188)

(Letter dated 30th January, 1952)

(For original application, see 1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, 2 : 282-291.)

With reference to the name of the swine kidney worm (Commission's Reference Z.N.(S.)188) I wish to go on record as advocating the preservation of the name *Stephanurus dentatus* Deising, 1839. To suppress the trivial name *dentatus* would, I believe, create a condition of endless confusion. The parasite is not only of considerable economic importance but has seldom been referred to by any other specific name. There are over 300 references to the parasite by this name and less than 25 references for the combined list of synonyms. It is of interest to note that the trivial name *pinguicola* Verrill, 1870, had never appeared in print in combination with the generic name *Stephanurus* until placed there by Dr. Ellsworth C. Dougherty (1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, 2 : 286) in his discussion of the correct name for the swine kidney worm.

Notwithstanding the excellent discussion by Dougherty (*l.c.*, 2 : 282-291), I believe there is some question as to whether there has ever been a condition of homonymy with reference to *Stephanurus dentatus* Diesing, 1839. To have a condition of homonymy it is necessary that two species with the same trivial name must be brought together under the same genus ; that is, the two species must be congeneric or so regarded.

In point (8) (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, 4 : 121) dealing with the rejection of secondary homonyms previous to 1st January, 1951, an author is excused from the requirement of regarding the two species as being congeneric. Although not so stated in point (8), one must presume that the Code requires that before an author can reject a trivial name of a species, the species in question must have been placed in a genus containing another species with the identical trivial name. I contend that the case of *Stephanurus dentatus* Diesing, 1839, does not meet this requirement ; and I will endeavour to show that there has never been a time when the two species of swine parasites, each with the trivial name *dentatus*, have been brought together under the same genus either by their common trivial name or by any other trivial name.

Here are, arranged chronologically, certain pertinent facts about the two swine nematodes with the trivial name *dentatus* that should not be overlooked :—

1803. Rudolphi named and described *Strongylus dentatus*, a nodular worm of swine.

1809. Rudolphi listed *dentatus* Rud., 1803, under the genus *Sclerostoma*. *Sclerostoma* Rudolphi, 1809, is a synonym of *Strongylus* Mueller, 1780, both genera having the same type species.

1839. Diesing named and described *Stephanurus dentatus*, the kidney worm of swine, as a new genus and a new species.

1861. Molin proposed the genus *Oesophagostomum* with *subulatum* Molin, 1861 as type species, and placed *dentatus* Rudolphi, 1803, in the genus as a synonym of *subulatum* Molin, 1861. This action of Molin not only made the trivial name *dentatus* Rud., 1803, the valid type species of *Oesophagostomum*, but removed *dentatus* Rudolphi from future consideration under the genus *Strongylus* and its synonym *Sclerostoma*.

1870. Verrill named and described *Sclerostoma pinguicola*, a synonym of *Stephanurus dentatus*, Diesing, 1839. This date (1870) appears to be the earliest at which the kidney worm of swine was referred to the genus *Sclerostoma* (= *Strongylus*) nine years after *dentatus* Rud., 1803, had been removed from the genus *Sclerostoma*. At this date (1870) the name *dentatus* Diesing, 1839, was not mentioned in combination with the genus *Sclerostoma*.

1874. Dean, in discussing the pathology of the kidney worm of swine, referred to the parasite as *Strongylus dentatus*, apparently a faulty determination, having confused the name of the parasite with the old name of the nodular worm of swine.

1894. de Magalhães was apparently the first author to raise the question of homonymy. He regarded *Stephanurus* as a synonym of *Strongylus* and believed that as at one time *Strongylus dentatus* Rudolphi, 1803, had been the name of a nodular worm of swine, the kidney worm of swine should take the trivial name *pinguicola* Verrill, 1870. At this date (1894) the trivial name *dentatus* Diesing, 1839, was not mentioned in combination with the genus *Strongylus*. Since de Magalhães did not indicate that he regarded *Oesophagostomum* Molin, 1861, (with *dentatus* Rudolphi as type species) as a synonym of *Strongylus* Mueller, 1780, he did not set up a condition of homonymy, as *dentatus* Rudolphi, 1803, had been removed from the genus *Strongylus* 33 years previously.

1896. Railliet's brief reference to *Stephanurus* as a synonym of *Sclerostomum* has been interpreted by Dougherty (l.c. : 285 (iii)) to mean that Railliet regarded the two species of swine parasites with the identical trivial name as being congeneric. This is contrary to the facts for Railliet not only in the paper of this date (1896 : 160), but in previous papers, as well as in later publications, recognised the genus *Oesophagostomum* which has *dentatus* Rudolphi, 1803, as type species.

1900. Tayler also regarded *Stephanurus* Diesing, 1839, as a synonym of *Sclerostoma*, but, contrary to the statement of Dougherty (l.c.), she did not regard the two parasites of swine with the same trivial name as being congeneric. In her publication of this date (1900 : 624) she referred to the nodular worm of swine as " (*Oesophagostoma dentatum*)." She did not use the trivial name *dentatus* Diesing, 1839, in combination with *Sclerostoma*.

At no time has any author placed the nodular worm of swine in the genus *Stephanurus* and at no time has any author placed the kidney worm of swine in the genus *Oesophagostomum*. In view of the above chronological facts it is difficult to comprehend how there can be a condition of homonymy envolving the species *Stephanurus dentatus* Diesing, 1839.

Even should the views of the esteemed and learned members of the Commission, in this case, not agree with the interpretation outlined above, the writer desires to go on record as in favour of retaining the specific name *Stephanurus dentatus* Diesing, 1839, for the swine kidney worm.

ON THE PROBLEM RELATING TO THE NAME "STEPHANURUS" DIESING, 1839 (CLASS NEMATODA) RAISED BY DR. ELLSWORTH C. DOUGHERTY

By JOHN M. LUCKER

(*Zoological Division, Agricultural Research Center, Beltsville, Maryland, U.S.A.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)188)

(Letter dated 6th February, 1952)

(For original application, see 1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, 2 : 283-291.)

In response to your "appeal to parasitologists" (Comm. ref. Z.N.(S.)188) in connection with the scientific name of the kidney worm of swine, I recommend that the International Commission preserve the name, *Stephanurus dentatus* Diesing, 1839, for this worm, not by exercising its plenary powers, but by doing all in its power to see to it that the next International Congress shall revoke all provisions of the Rules which presently do apply, or in the past have applied, to so-called secondary homonymy and shall substitute therefor provisions which will ensure for the past and future, that the priority of a trivial name, which was, or is, originally perfectly valid and available when proposed in a genus which also was, or is, perfectly valid and available when proposed, cannot be permanently impaired by any action of any subsequent author and that any author who recognises the genus so proposed, but who recognises as congeneric with the animal bearing this originally valid and available trivial name, no other animal for which the same trivial name was earlier validly proposed, shall have the right and obligation to use this trivial name for the animal in that genus.

ON THE TRIVIAL NAME TO BE USED FOR THE KIDNEY WORM OF SWINE (CLASS NEMATODA): COMMENT ON PROPOSAL SUBMITTED BY DR. ELLSWORTH C. DOUGHERTY

By HAROLD W. MANTER

(*University of Nebraska, Department of Zoology, Lincoln, Nebraska, U.S.A.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)188)

(Letter dated 27th September 1952)

It is probably too late to count, but, as a taxonomic helminthologist, I wish to object to the proposal of Dougherty (1950) to replace the trivial name *dentatus* of Diesing, 1839 (kidney worm of swine) with *pinguicola* of Verrill, 1870. The name *Stephanurus dentatus* is so well established in the literature both of parasitology and veterinary medicine that it surely should be validated.

Dougherty made his proposal in *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 2 : 282-291 in August 1951.

COMMENT ON THE APPLICATION SUBMITTED BY DR. ELLSWORTH C. DOUGHERTY IN REGARD TO THE TRIVIAL NAME "DENTATUS" DIESING, 1839, AS PUBLISHED IN THE COMBINATION "STEPHANURUS DENTATUS" (CLASS NEMATODA)

By ROBERT PH. DOLLFUS
(*Laboratoire d'Helminthologie Coloniale et de Parasitologie Comparée, Museum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)188)
(Letter dated 16th October 1952)
(For application, see 1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 2 : 282-291)

Je viens de recevoir un separatum de E. C. Dougherty concernant la question de la possibilité de rejeter l'appellation *Stephanurus dentatus* Diesing, 1839, parce qu'il existe un *Strongylus dentatus* Rudolphi, 1803.

Comme Diesing d'une part, et Rudolphi d'autre part, n'ont pas employé le nom specifique dans le même genre, il n'a eu aucune raison valable pour changer le nom spécifique employé par Diesing et toute controverse à ce sujet est, a mon avis, inutile ; c'est du temps perdu de discuter la-dessus. En outre, comme il est impossible de confondre des Nematodes aussi differents que *Stephanurus dentatus* Diesing et *Oesophagostomum dentatum* (Rudolphi), tout changement de ces appellations pourrait être nuisible.

Si quelques auteurs ont confondu ces deux espèces, cela montre à quel point ils sont incompetents en matière de Nematodes parasites et il n'y a pas à s'occuper de leur erreur.

SUPPORT FOR PROFESSOR HAROLD E. VOKES' PROPOSAL RELATING TO THE GENERIC NAME "MYTILUS" LINNAEUS, 1758 (CLASS PELECYPODA)

By JOSEPH P. E. MORRISON
(*Smithsonian Institution, United States National Museum, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)193)
(Letter dated 4th October 1951)
(For application, see 1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 2 : 31-32)

Both as a specialist on the Mollusks, and as a former teacher of Zoology in High School, College, and University, may I go on record as *wholeheartedly in support of* Dr. Vokes' petition to the International Commission to use its plenary powers in the case of *Mytilus* Linnaeus, to fix the species *edulis* Linnaeus as the type species.

In my opinion, this is exactly the sort of case for which the International Commission has been granted such plenary powers. Without such a *nomen conservandum* action as requested in this case, two Family or Subfamily names would have to be changed, as well as every High School Zoology text-book I have ever seen in the United States !

COMMENT ON DR. JIŘÍ PACLT'S PROPOSAL RELATING TO THE GENERIC NAME "SPHINX" LINNAEUS, 1758 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER LEPIDOPTERA)

By JOHN G. FRANCLEMONT
(*United States Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)280)
(Extract from a letter dated 18th September 1952.)

In Part 10 of volume 6 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* just received, I note a number of requests for use of the Plenary Powers of the Commission by Dr. Paclt. I am submitting the following comments on them.

Paragraph 2 of Dr. Paclt's application Z.N.(S.)280 (p. 291)

Stephens, 1828 (June) (*Illustrations of British Entomology*, Haustellata, vol. **1**, p. 121) does not select a type species for *Sphinx* Linnaeus, 1758 ; however Curtis does select *Sphinx ligustri* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of *Sphinx* Linnaeus, 1758, in 1828 (January) (*British Entomology*, vol. **5**, p. 195). If Stephens had designated a type species, Curtis' action would have antedated it.

COMMENT ON DR. JIŘÍ PACLT'S PROPOSAL RELATING TO THE GENERIC NAME "DILOBA" BOISDUVAL, 1840 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER LEPIDOPTERA)

By JOHN G. FRANCLEMONT
(*United States Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)332)

(Extract from a letter dated 18th September 1952)

In Part 10 of volume 6 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* just received, I note a number of requests for use of the Plenary Powers of the Commission by Dr. Paclt. I am submitting the following comments on them.

Dr. Paclt's application Z.N.(S.)332 (pp. 315-317)

This proposal ignores *Heteromorpha* Hübner (1806) (*Tentamen*, p. [1]), for which see *Opinion* 97, and *Heteromorpha* Hübner, 1822 (*Systematisch-alphabetische Verzeichniss*, etc., pp. 15 and 18). In the *Tentamen* the name included only *caeruleocephala* Linnaeus, 1758; while in the *Systematisch-alphabetische Verzeichniss* it included that species plus *pantherina* Hübner [1800-1803]. Kirby in 1892 (*Synoptic Catalogue of the Lepidoptera Heterocera*, vol. **1**, p. 585) selected *Phalaena Bombyx caeruleocephala* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of *Heteromorpha* Hübner. Thus *Heteromorpha* Hübner, 1822, antedates *Diloba* Boisduval, 1840, and takes precedence over it, the genera being isogenotypic. *Heteromorpha* has been used for *caeruleocephala* by some authors.

Stephens, 1828 (*Illustrations of British Entomology*, vol. **2**, p. 14) did not select *Phalaena Bombyx caeruleocephala* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of *Episema*, but Duponchel, 1829 (March) (*in* Godart, *Histoire naturelle des Lépidoptères de France*, vol. **7**, Part 2, p. 71) did select this species as the type species of *Episema* Ochsemheimer, 1816.

The present British Lists are using *Episema* for *caeruleocephala*, and this follows Hampson, 1913 (*Catalogue of the Lepidoptera Phalaenae in the British Museum*, vol. **13**, p. 593). In 1906 Hampson (*Catalogue of the Lepidotera Phalaenae in the British Museum*, vol. **6**, p. 229) used *Derthisa* Walker, 1857, in the sense that Dr. Paclt calls, "quite unknown name"; it is also used in Seitz's *Macrolepidoptera of the World* (vol. **3**, p. 119, 1910).

The zoological position assigned to *caeruleocephala*, while really outside the consideration of the problem at hand, is open to question. The THYATIRIDAE (TETHEIDAE) possess an abdominal tympanum, *caeruleocephala* possesses a thoracic tympanum like the Noctuoidea (Phalaenoidea), the venation of the wings is like the NOCTUIDAE (PHALAENIDAE), and the structural characters of the larva place it in this family also, not the THYATIRIDAE.

SUPPORT FOR DR. GILBERT RANSON'S PROPOSAL RELATING TO THE NAME "GRYPHAEA" LAMARCK, 1819 (CLASS PELECYPODA)

By the Members of the Shellfish Sub-Committee of the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)365)

(Letter dated 2nd April 1952, with enclosures, addressed by Dr. B. Havinga, Chairman of the Shellfish Sub-Committee of the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea, to Dr. P. Korringa (*Rijksinstituut voor Visscherijonderzoek, Bergen op Zoom, The Netherlands*))

(Communicated by Dr. P. Korringa under cover of a letter dated 3rd April 1952)

Enclosed I am sending to you the answers which I have received in reply to the circular letter, which has been distributed among the members of the Shellfish Sub-committee of the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea.

I should like to express my opinion on this subject as Chairman of the Committee.

I wish to support strongly Dr. Korringa in his request for the retention of the generic name *Gryphaea*. This name is generally known and used, and the suppression of this name in favour of *Crassostrea* would lead to confusion and great difficulties.

Enclosure 1

Letter dated 16th January 1952 from Sven Segerstråle (*Museum Zoologicum Universitatis, Helsinki, Finland*)

Thank you very much for your letter of 11th January about the nomenclature problem concerning the generic name of *Gryphaea*.

Like you I agree with Dr. Korringa's view that we should try to conserve the name *Gryphaea* for the Portuguese oyster and its closest allies. I have only too often regretted the perpetual changes in zoological nomenclature and am glad to contribute to conserving the *status quo* in this case.

Enclosure 2

Letter dated 16th January 1952 from H. A. Cole (*Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, Fisheries Experiment Station, Castle Bank, Conway, Caernarvonshire*)

Thank you for your letter of 11th January regarding the retention of the generic name *Gryphaea* for the Portuguese oyster and its nearest allies. I am, of course, aware of the controversy over its name and I have had some correspondence on the subject with American workers.

I am pleased to support Dr. Korringa in his request for the retention of this well-established name. I believe that to suppress it in favour of *Crassostrea* would lead to additional confusion.

Enclosure 3

Letter dated 17th January 1952 from M. Desbrosses (*Office Scientifique et Technique des Pêches Maritimes*, 59, *Avenue Raymond Poincaré, Paris* (*XVIe*))

Je suis d'accord pour que le Sous-Comité du " Shellfish " recommande de conserver le nom de *Gryphaea* pour l'Huître Portugaise et les espèces voisines, à la Commission Internationale de Nomenclature Zoologique.

Enclosure 4

Letter dated 18th January 1952 from E. Leloup (*Institut Royal des Sciences Naturelles de Belgique, Bruxelles* 4, *le Rue Vautier*, 31)

J'ai l'honneur de vous accuser réception de votre lettre du 11 janvier 1952 et de ses annexes.

Comme je l'ai dit à la séance du Shellfish Subcommittee à Amsterdam, je ne suis pas partisan d'appliquer à la lettre les règles de nomenclature zoologique pour le cas *Gryphaea*. Je propose de maintenir le nom *Gryphaea*, consacré par l'usage.

A ce propos, j'ai consulté mes collègues malacologistes de l'Institut Royal des Sciences naturelles, MM. M. Glibert, Conservateur et W. Adam, conservateur adjoint. Ils sont du même avis.

Enclosure 5

Letter dated 22nd January 1952 from A. M. Ramalho (*Instituto de Biologia Maritima, Caise do Sodré, Lisboa*)

In reply to your letter of the 11th January, I beg to inform you that I quite agree that the Shellfish Sub-committee should recommend the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to conserve the name *Gryphaea* for the Portuguese Oyster and its allied species. This means, if I understand correctly, that the Sub-committee will be in favour of the issue described as under (2) of S4 of the note by M. F. Hemming you so kindly sent with your letter.

Enclosure 6

Letter dated 4th February 1952 from C. E. Lucas (*Scottish Home Department, Marine Laboratory, Wood Street, Torry, Aberdeen*)

Turning now to the problem about the naming of the Portuguese oyster, in principle it seems that the name ought to be *Crassostrea*, but in practice there seems to be no doubt that we should favour the retention of the name *Gryphaea*. I hope, therefore, that the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature will be able to conserve the name *Gryphaea*.

DR. JOHN G. FRANCLEMONT'S PROPOSAL FOR THE USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO SUPPRESS THE GENERIC NAME "PHALAENA" LINNAEUS, 1758, AND TO VALIDATE, AS FROM 1758, THE TERMS EMPLOYED BY LINNAEUS FOR GROUPS OF THAT GENUS (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER LEPIDOPTERA): PROPOSED ADDITION OF "PHALAENA" LINNAEUS, 1758 TO THE "OFFICIAL LIST OF GENERIC NAMES IN ZOOLOGY"

By JIŘÍ PACLT
(*Bratislava, Czechoslovakia*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)462)

(Letter dated 14th July 1952)

I entirely disagree with Dr. John G. Franclemont's proposal (1952, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **6** : 304-312) for the validation, as of subgeneric status, of the terms used by Linnaeus in 1758, to denote the groups into which he divided the genus *Phalaena* Linnaeus, 1758. My view in this matter is not confined to the particular terms discussed by Dr. Franclemont, but apply equally to all similar terms used by Linnaeus for subdivisions of genera established by him in 1758. See my paper on this subject published in 1947 (*Acta Soc. ent. Cechosl.* **44** : 37). For if we accept any of these terms as being the names of subgenera, we should be bound logically to adopt the same course by analogy in the case of the terms used by Linnaeus for subdivisions of the genus *Papilio*.

2. In the case of *Papilio* Linnaeus, 1758, there are six of these terms, namely :—(1) *Barbarus* ; (2) *Eques* ; (3) *Heliconius* ; (4) *Danaus* ; (5) *Nymphalis* ; (6) *Plebejus*. Of these the first two have been disregarded for many years, but as regards each of the remainder we now have a generally accepted nomenclatorial usage, namely :—

Heliconius Kluk, 1802	Type species :	*Papilio charithonia* Linnaeus, 1758
Danaus Kluk, 1802	do.	*Papilio plexippus* Linnaeus, 1758
Nymphalis Kluk, 1802	do.	*Papilio polychloros* Linnaeus, 1758
Plebejus Kluk, 1802	do.	*Papilio argus* Linnaeus, 1758.

3. In these circumstances it will be evident that no useful purpose whatever would be served by validating as from 1758, the terms used by Linnaeus for subdivisions of the genus *Papilio* Linnaeus, 1758, and, indeed, that nothing but confusion would result from such action.

4. When we turn to consider the parallel problem presented by the terms used by Linnaeus in 1758 for subdivisions of the genus *Phalaena* Linnaeus, we find that, with a few exceptions these terms are generally accepted as generic names either as from Fabricius, 1775 (*Syst. Ent.*) or from Denis & Schiffermüller, 1775 (*Ankünd. syst. Werkes Schmett. Wienergegend*). The usages so accepted are as follows :—

Bombyx Fabricius, 1775	Type species :	*Phalaena mori* Linnaeus, 1758
Geometra Denis & Schiff., 1775	do.	*Phalaena papilionaria* Linnaeus, 1758
Tortrix Denis & Schiff., 1775	do.	*Phalaena viridana* Linnaeus, 1758
Pyralis Fabricius, 1775	do.	*Phalaena farinalis* Linnaeus, 1758
Tinea Fabricius, 1775	do.	*Phalaena pellionella* Linnaeus, 1758
Alucita Fabricius, 1775	do.	*Phalaena pentadactyla* Linnaeus, 1758.

5. In the case of the names *Bombyx* and *Pyralis*, the foregoing usage is not in strict accord with the requirements of the *Règles*. In these cases proposals have been submitted to the International Commission for the use of the plenary powers to validate existing usage. See my application Z.N.(S.)288 on *Bombyx* Fabricius (1952, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **6** : 313-314) and Z.N.(S.)331 on *Pyralis* Fabricius (1952, *ibid.* **6** : 314-315).

6. We have to note also that in the case of the term *Noctua* as used by Linnaeus to denote a group of the genus *Phalaena* there is (as in the case of *Papilio Eques*) a further problem which would require consideration, for it is clear that, if there were such a subgeneric name as *Noctua* Linnaeus, 1758, its type species would not be the same species as that of *Phalaena* Linnaeus, 1758, for the type species of *Noctua* Linnaeus, 1758, would be *Phalaena pronuba* Linnaeus, 1758, while that of *Phalaena* Linnaeus, 1758, is *Phalaena typica* Linnaeus, 1758.

7. In these circumstances I must ask why Dr. Franclemont wishes to disturb the well-established practice of ignoring all the terms used by Linnaeus in 1758 for subdivisions of genera then established. In this connection I must point out that Dr. Franclemont's proposals would involve the cancellation, or at least the modification, of the Commission's *Opinion* 124, which states: "The various subdivisions of genera published by Linnaeus in 1758 are not to be accepted as of this date (1758) as of subgeneric value under the International Rules."

8. If in despite of *Opinion* 124 we were to accept the terms used by Linnaeus to denote groups of species within his genera as being names of subgeneric status as from 1758, we should be confronted with serious and quite unnecessary difficulties. For example, we should probably have to take special steps to preserve the name *Eques* Bloch, 1793, the name of a well-known genus of fishes, which, in the absence of such action, would fall as a junior homonym of *Eques* Linnaeus, 1758. Again, we should be confronted with such problems as those presented by the name "*Barbarus*" (properly *Papilio Barbarus*), the position as regards which was discussed by Tutt in 1905 (*Ent. Rec.* **17** : 211). No doubt also similar problems would arise in the case of groups of animals other than the Order Lepidoptera, with which alone we are here concerned. Unless serious reasons could be brought forward in favour of such a course, it would, indeed, in my opinion, be ridiculous to disturb the ruling given in *Opinion* 124, an *Opinion* which, though of relatively recent date, has made a substantial contribution to the central aim of the *Règles*, namely the stabilisation of zoological nomenclature.

9. Finally, I must make it clear that I am strongly opposed to Dr. Franclemont's proposal for the suppression of the name *Phalaena* Linnaeus, 1758. Dr. Franclemont suggests that the family name (NOCTUIDAE) derived from the generic name *Noctua* is "long-established and familiar." In my view, however, there are two rivals of that family name: for many decades the family name AGROTIDAE has been used in Europe for the family in question, while in America the name PHALAENIDAE prevails.

10. Like the name *Papilio* Linnaeus, 1758, the name *Phalaena* Linnaeus, 1758, is a well-known name, even though it has often been used in an ambiguous way. I think it desirable that this name should now be officially recognised and I accordingly ask the International Commission to do this by placing this name on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*. The request now submitted is therefore that the International Commission should :—

(1) place on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* the generic name *Phalaena* Linnaeus, 1758 (gender of generic name: feminine) (type species, under Rule (*b*) in Article 30 (use of the word *typica* as the trivial name of an included species): *Phalaena typica* Linnaeus, 1758 (*Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 512);

(2) place on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* the trivial name *typica* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the combination *Phalaena typica*) (trivial name of type species of *Phalaena* Linnaeus, 1758).

SUPPORT FOR DR. JOHN G. FRANCLEMONT'S PROPOSALS FOR THE USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO SUPPRESS THE NAME "PHALAENA" LINNAEUS, 1758, AND TO VALIDATE, AS OF SUBGENERIC STATUS, THE TERMS THEN APPLIED TO GROUPS OF SPECIES OF THAT GENUS

By WM. T. M. FORBES
(*New York State College of Agriculture at Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)462)

(Extract from a letter dated 18th August 1952)

(*For the original application in this case, see* 1952, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **6** : 304-312)

I am writing you, at Dr. Franclemont's suggestion, in connection with his paper on the Linnean subgenera and their type species.

I feel that his solution, both as to names and as to type species, is highly advisable, with the possible exception of the name *Alucita*, which has been used as nearly equally in two different families, that I think it might be thrown overboard, by whichever formal suspension of rules is practicable.

ON THE PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO SUPPRESS THE GENERIC NAME "PHALAENA" LINNAEUS, 1758 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER LEPIDOPTERA) AND TO VALIDATE, AS OF SUBGENERIC STATUS, CERTAIN TERMS THEN USED BY LINNAEUS FOR SUB-DIVISIONS OF THAT GENUS : REPLY TO CERTAIN CRITICISMS MADE BY DR. JIŘÍ PACLT

By JOHN G. FRANCLEMONT
(*United States Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Administration, Bureau of Entomology & Plant Quarantine, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)462)

(Enclosure to a letter dated 21st August 1952)

I have seen Dr. Paclt's objections (Paclt, 1952, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **9** : 147-148) to my proposal (Franclemont, 1952, *ibid.* 6 : 304-312) for a use of the Plenary Powers to validate the names used for the subgenera of *Phalaena* by Linnaeus in 1758. I feel that he has misunderstood the intent of my proposal. I do not wish to cancel or modify *Opinion* 124 ; I am merely acting within the intent of the published meaning of the *Opinion*, wherein it is stated : " . . ., but if any group of specialists finds that because of the literature on said group this *Opinion* will produce greater confusion than uniformity, the Commission is prepared to take up individual cases under the arguments which may be submitted." If the Commission were to act favourably on these names, it would not impair *Opinion* 124 or its subsequent revision at Paris in 1948 ; it would not involve any names but those used as subgeneric categories by Linnaeus under *Phalaena ;* all other names, no matter what their status in Linnaeus, 1758, lie outside the boundaries of the question under consideration.

I cannot agree with the statement that " . . ., with few exceptions these terms are generally accepted as generic names either as from Fabricius, 1775 (*Syst. Ent.*) or from Denis and Schiffermüller, 1775 (*Ankünd. syst. Werkes Schmett. Wienergegend*)." I think the reverse is true, for they are and were generally credited to Linnaeus with few exceptions. Fabricius does not credit the names to Linnaeus, but this can be readily understood because he has modified the application of the names in some cases, and he rather fancied himself as the originator of a new system. Denis and Schiffermüller credit the names to Linnaeus. The *Dictionnaire d'Histoire Naturelle* edited by d'Orbigny breaks with Latreille, who credited almost everything to Fabricius, by crediting the names to Linnaeus. Sherborn (*Index Animalium*, Pars prima (1758-1800) : 740) credits the names to Linnaeus and says : " . . . apparently used in a subgeneric sense." The workers in the United States have always thought of the names as originating with Linnaeus. Staudinger, 1901, credits them to Linnaeus, but cites them from the 12th edition instead of the 10th Edition of the *Systema Naturae*. As we all know, there was considerable discussion about whether to start with the Tenth or the Twelfth Edition, and it was the present Code that established the tenth edition as the starting point.

With regard to *Alucita* Fabricius, 1775 ; as I have pointed out, this was used for twenty species, part of which were included by Linnaeus under *Tinea* in 1758 and 1767, but none that he included under *Alucita*. The type species suggested by Dr. Paclt is not included by Fabricius ; it is under *Pterophorus* Fabricius, and this name must now date from Fabricius, 1775, because Geoffroy's work in which this name is first proposed is not binominal. Walsingham in the *Biologia centrali-americana*, Insecta, Lepidoptera-Heterocera **4** : 89, 1911, pointed out the two different uses of *Alucita* and selected as the type of *Alucita* Fabricius (nec *Alucita* Linnaeus) *Phalaena Tinea DeGeerella*—*Alucita degeerella* (Linnaeus).

With regard to *Phalaena* and *Noctua ;* see Article 9, which states that if a genus is divided into subgenera the name of the typical subgenus must be the same as the name of the genus. One of the subgeneric names used by Linnaeus in 1758 must be the typical subgenus of *Phalaena*. Barnes and Benjamin in the 1923, *Contributions to the Natural History of the Lepidoptera of North America* **5** (Part 2) : 55 have demonstrated that *Phalaena* Linnaeus, 1758, and *Noctua* Linnaeus, 1758, both proposed as new and with *Noctua* as a subgeneric category, are isogenotypic with *Phalaena Noctua typica* Linnaeus, 1758, as type (see Article 30, Rule (*b*)).

It comes as something of a surprise to learn that it was a well established practice to ignore the subgeneric names of *Phalaena* proposed by Linnaeus in 1758 and 1761, see my comments above on crediting of these names. The names were anything but ignored, they were used all or in part by all workers and credited to Linnaeus either directly or indirectly. Likewise to place the usage of *Phalaena* in the same class as that of *Papilio* is, to me, a misrepresentation of the facts, because *Phalaena* was all but abandoned in the early 1800's and the subgeneric terms, quite unlike those of *Papilio*, came to have more use than the generic term.

I would take issue with " (as published in the combination *Phalaena typica*)," the original combination as published is " *P. Noctua typica*," *Phalaena* being abbreviated. I think we should be absolutely accurate in citing original combinations, even if parts are suppressed by the action of the Commission, in such cases we should refer to the *Opinion* in which the suppression is made.

Finally with regard to the names NOCTUIDAE, AGROTIDAE and PHALAENIDAE ; in my original paper I made some mention of the usage of these names. I have tried to find some basis for Dr. Paclt's statement that AGROTIDAE has been used in Europe for decades. The name seems to have had no vogue after Grote suggested the change in 1895 ; the present usage dates from Tams, 1935. Boursin was apparently the first worker on the Continent to change from NOCTUIDAE to AGROTIDAE, and this was in 1936. Kozhantshikov in 1937 (*Faune de l'USSR*, Insectes, Lépidoptères **13** (No. 3)) used NOCTUIDAE. Warren and Draudt in Volume 3 and supplement of Seitz's *Grosschmetterlinge der Erde* published from 1909-1914 and 1931-1938 use NOCTUIDAE. Eckstein in 1920 in *Die Schmetterlinge Deutschlands* Band **3**, uses NOCTUIDAE, so does Gaede in *Die Tierwelt Deutschlands*, **14**, Schmetterlinge, oder Lepidoptera part 2 Nachtfalter (Heterocera). Macrolepidoptera." Bourgogne in the *Traité de Zoologie*, Vol. 10, fascicule 1 published in 1951 uses NOCTUIDAE, so does Viette, also of the Paris Museum, use NOCTUIDAE in his recent papers. Bang-Haas used NOCTUIDAE in his *Novitates Macrolepidopterologicae*, Vol. 1-5 published from 1926-1930. The *Zoological Record* did not change from NOCTUIDAE to AGROTIDAE until Vol. 81 for 1944 published in 1947, the separate Insecta part appeared a year early, 1946. Perhaps Dr. Paclt can cite works I have overlooked, not that the above list is complete ; it merely represents the titles of works which are on my desk.

SUPPORT FOR DR. JOHN G. FRANCLEMONT'S PROPOSALS FOR THE USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO SUPPRESS THE GENERIC NAME " PHALAENA " LINNAEUS, 1758, AND TO VALIDATE, AS OF SUBGENERIC STATUS, THE TERMS THEN USED TO DENOTE GROUPS OF THAT GENUS (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER LEPIDOPTERA)

By FREDERICK H. RINDGE
(*The American Museum of Natural History, New York*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)462)

(Letter dated 4th September 1952)

(For Dr. Franclemont's application, see 1952, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **6** : 304-312)

Recently I received a letter from Mr. Franclemont of the United States National Museum informing me that you are interested in obtaining the opinions of qualified workers on his paper entitled " The Linnaean Subgeneric Names of *Phalaena* (Lepidoptera, Heterocera)." As I have charge of the Lepidoptera collection here at the American Museum of Natural History, and as I work primarily with the moths, I believe I would qualify.

I agree with the conclusions expressed in the above-mentioned paper, and unless additional information is brought forth, I certainly hope that the Commission will take action on this question as indicated in this paper. Such action would certainly lead to a uniformity in the application of names in the Lepidoptera, and it would definitely lead to stability.

SUPPORT FOR DR. JOHN G. FRANCLEMONT'S PROPOSAL RELATING TO THE GENERIC NAME " PHALAENA " LINNAEUS, 1758, AND MATTERS CONNECTED THEREWITH (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER LEPIDOPTERA)

By A. DIAKONOFF
(*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The Netherlands*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)462)

(Letter dated 26th September 1952)

Upon an invitation of Mr. Franclemont (addressed to Mr. Lempke) I am glad to comment upon his paper on the Linnean " Subgeneric Names," recently republished in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* (**6** : 304-312).

As you perhaps remember, I had the pleasure of discussing this paper with you during your visit to our Museum in August 1951 ; at that time I expressed myself entirely in agreement with Mr. Franclemont's views, and thought that a proposal to the International Commission on the lines recommended by Dr. Franclemont would be most useful, and would contribute to uniformity and stability of the nomenclature of Lepidoptera.

In the meantime I discovered that the validity of the well-known and familiar generic name *Tortrix*, and with it of the family name TORTRICIDAE (with which group I am especially concerned !) is seriously endangered. Dr. Obraztsov of Sea Cliffe, N.Y., draws my attention to the fact that under the present Rules the first valid author of *Tortrix* appears to be not Thunberg, but Scopoli, 1777 ; consequently *Tortrix* might fall as a synonym of some horrible old name such as, e.g., *Heterognomon* Lederer, 1859 (*Wien. ent. Monatsch.* **3** : 242). To prevent this disaster I even more warmly advocate accepting Mr. Franclemont's proposals.

As to the familiar generic name *Tinea*, I may draw your attention to the paper by A. Steven Corbet and W. H. T. Tams published in the 1943 (*Entomologist* 76 (961) : 113-114), where those authors replace the name *Tinea* Linnaeus by that of *Tinaea* Geoffroy, 1762. Their view (and the changed spelling *Tinaea* and TINAEIDAE) has been accepted by several authors (among whom by myself), but it unavoidably leads to more confusion. The acceptance of Mr. Franclemont's proposals would put an end to this instability as well.

ON THE CONSEQUENTIAL ACTION IN REGARD TO THE GENERIC NAME "TINAEA" GEOFFROY, 1762 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER LEPIDOPTERA) WHICH WOULD BE NEEDED IN THE EVENT OF APPROVAL BEING GIVEN TO DR. JOHN G. FRANCLEMONT'S PROPOSAL THAT THE NAME "TINEA" SHOULD BE VALIDATED UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS AS FROM LINNAEUS, 1758

By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)462)

In a letter supporting Dr. John G. Franclemont's proposal (1952, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **6** : 304-312) that the terms used by Linnaeus in 1758 to denote groups of species of the genus *Phalaena* Linnaeus, 1758, Dr. A. Diakonoff has drawn attention (1952, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **9** : 151) to a paper by the late Dr. A. Steven Corbet and Mr. W. H. T. Tams (1943, *Entomologist* **76** : 113-114), in which those authors, in an attempt to secure a stable foundation, if not for the name *Tinea*, at least for a name closely resembling it, brought forward the proposal that this genus should in future be known by the name *Tinaea* Geoffroy, 1762 (*Hist. abrég. Ins. Env. Paris* **2** : 25, 173), for which they then selected *Phalaena Tinea pellionella* Linnaeus, 1758, to be the type species.

2. Geoffroy in his *Histoire abrégée* did not apply the principles of binominal nomenclature, using instead the system formerly known as "binary nomenclature." At the time when Corbet & Tams wrote their paper, the question whether a generic name published by a "binary," but not binominal author should be accepted as possessing any status of availability in virtue of having been so published was *sub judice*. The Corbet/Tams proposal relating to the name *Tinaea* Geoffroy was therefore necessarily provisional from the standpoint of the *Règles* until the underlying question of principle had been settled. In 1948 the International Congress of Zoology ruled against the acceptance of generic names published by non-binominal authors (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 63-66), and the Commission, which already had before it an application for a ruling on the availability of generic names first published in Geoffroy's *Histoire abrégée*, thereupon ruled that those names were not available ; the Commission added at the same time that it would be prepared to entertain proposals for the validation of individual generic names in this book, where it could be shown that confusion would otherwise arise and asked the Secretary to confer with interested specialists on this subject (1950, *ibid.* **4** : 366-369).

3. It will be seen that the use of the plenary powers would be needed to secure the validation of the name *Tinaea* Geoffroy, 1762, just as it would to provide a valid foundation for the name *Tinea* as from Linnaeus, 1758. From this point of view there is therefore nothing to choose between a proposal to validate *Tinaea* Geoffroy and one to validate *Tinea* Linnaeus. From the practical point of view the latter course has however important advantages, (1) because it would retain for this genus a name spelt in the traditional way (*Tinea*), avoiding the awkward and unaccustomed variant *Tinaea* and TINAEIDAE, and (2) because under it Linnaeus would become officially what he has long been unofficially regarded as being, namely, the author of this generic name.

4. Accordingly, my conclusion as between the two alternatives discussed above is that, if the plenary powers are to be used to regularise the position of this and the other important names covered by the application submitted to the International Commission by Dr. John G. Franclemont, the validation of *Tinea* as from Linnaeus, 1758, is greatly to be preferred to the validation, in its place, of *Tinaea* Geoffroy, 1762. I therefore recommend that, so far as this genus is concerned, the question on which consideration should be concentrated is whether in the interests of nomenclatorial stability the plenary powers should be used to validate the name *Tinea*, as of subgeneric status, as from Linnaeus, 1758, with *Phalaena Tinea pellionella* Linnaeus, 1758, as type species. In the event of that proposal being approved the only action that would be called for, as regards the name *Tinaea* Geoffroy, 1762, would be to place it upon the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology*, where, being an invalid name, it properly belongs.

IN SUPPORT OF THE APPLICATION TO SUSPEND THE RULES TO (a) VALIDATE SEVEN GENERIC NAMES OF LINNAEUS AS OF 1758, AND DESIGNATE THEIR TYPE SPECIES (b) SUPPRESS THE GENERIC NAME "PHALAENA" LINNAEUS, 1758, GIVE PREFERENCE TO ITS TYPICAL SUBGENUS "NOCTUA," DECLARE "NOCTUIDAE" THE CORRECT NAME FOR THE FAMILY, AND (c) VALIDATE ONE GENERIC NAME OF LINNAEUS AS OF 1767 AND DESIGNATE ITS TYPE SPECIES (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER LEPIDOPTERA)

By CYRIL F. DOS PASSOS, LL.B.

(*Research Associate, American Museum of Natural History, New York*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)462)

(Enclosure to letter dated 14th October 1952)

I desire to support the application made to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature by Dr. John G. Franclemont (1952, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **6** : 304-312) to suspend the rules, to validate the following generic names of Linnaeus as of 1758 : *Bombyx*, *Noctua*, *Geometra*, *Pyralis*, *Tortrix*, *Tinea* and *Alucita*, to designate their type species, to suppress the generic name *Phalaena* Linnaeus, 1758, to give preference to its typical subgenus *Noctua* Linnaeus, 1758, to declare NOCTUIDAE the correct name for the family, to validate one generic name of Linnaeus as of 1767, i.e., *Attacus*, and designate its type species, as set forth in detail in the said application, and in a paper published by Dr. Franclemont in 1950.

2. While *Opinion* 124 declares that the various subdivisions of genera published by Linnaeus in 1758, *Systema Naturae*, Tenth Edition, are not to be accepted as of that date as of subgeneric value under the rules, it was recognized that, if this *Opinion* would produce greater confusion than uniformity, the Commission would be prepared to consider individual cases submitted to them by the specialists concerned.

3. McDunnough's *Check List* (1938, 1939), which is in current use in North America and probably elsewhere, uses all the generic names involved in this application, as set forth by Dr. Franclemont, with the exception of *Noctua*, for which *Phalaena* is used. The generic names in question, with the exception of *Phalaena*, have been in constant use for a very long time. To upset their usage now would cause greater confusion than uniformity. While it is unfortunate to suppress one of the three original generic names (*Phalaena*) of Linnaeus, not to do so will only result in suppressing an almost equally well-known name (*Noctua*). There is, therefore, good reason for not adhering strictly to the rules in this case.

4. Dr. Jiři Paclt in the same number of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* (6 : 313-315) under Commission's references Z.N.(S.)288 and Z.N.(S.)331 has made partial parallel applications for the proposed use of the plenary powers to designate *Phalaena mori* Linnaeus, 1758 to be the type species of *Bombyx* Fabricius, 1775 and to designate *Phalaena Pyralis farinalis* Linnaeus, 1758 to be the type species of *Pyralis* Fabricius, 1775, the only difference between Dr. Franclemont's application and that of Dr. Paclt in these two cases being that in the former application these generic names are credited to Linnaeus, 1758, rather than Fabricius, 1775, as in the latter application. While the work of Fabricius was the first in which these names were used in a strictly generic sense, Dr. Franclemont (1952, *tom. cit.* : 306) has pointed out that, if these names were to be accepted from this work, considerable confusion would arise when all the generic names involved in his application are considered. Consequently, it is believed advisable to make a clean sweep of all later uses of these names and settle them all as of 1758. Commission's references Z.N.(S.)462, Z.N.(S.)288 and Z.N.(S.)331 could well be consolidated and considered as one.

5. In *Opinion* 158 the Commission considered such a case, as are involved in the three above-mentioned applications, recognized that an exception should be made for *Locusta* Linnaeus, 1758, and designated the type species. *Opinion* 124 gives ample authority for granting this application and the case considered in *Opinion* 158 is a perfect precedent for a similar ruling in the instant case.

Literature Cited

Fabricius, Johann Christian

1775. *Systema Entomologiae, sistens Insectorum Classes, Ordines, Genera, Species, adiectis synonymis, locis, descriptionibus, observationibus.* Flensburg and Leipzig, Kortii, [32] + 832 pp.

Franclemont, John George

1950. The Linnaean subgeneric names of *Phalaena* (Lepidoptera, Heterocera). *J. New York ent. Soc,* **58** : 41-53.

Linnaeus, Carolus [Carl von Linné]

1758. *Systema Naturae per Regna tria Naturae, secundum Classes, Ordines, Genera, Species, cum Characteribus, differentiis, synonymis, locis.* Editio decima, reformata. Stockholm, Laurentii Salvii, 1 : [4] + 824 pp.

1767. *Systema Naturae per Regna tria Naturae, secundum Classes, Ordines, Genera, Species, cum characteribus, differentiis, synonymis, locis.* Editio duodecima, reformata. Stockholm, Laurentii Salvii, 1 : [2] + 533-535, 356-357 [*sic*], 538, 359-360 [*sic*], 541-605, 506 [*sic*], 607-891, 902 [*sic*], 893-1328 + [36] pp.

McDunnough, James Halliday

1938. Check list of the Lepidoptera of Canada and the United States of America. Part I. Macrolepidoptera. *Mem. S. Calif. Acad. Sci.,* **1** : 1-272, 1-3 (corrigenda).

1939. Check list of the Lepidoptera of Canada and the United States of America. Part II. Microlepidoptera. *Mem. S. Calif. Acad. Sci.* **2** : 1-171.

COMMENT ON DR. JIŘÍ PACLT'S PROPOSAL RELATING TO THE GENERIC NAME " BOMBYX " FABRICIUS, 1775 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER LEPIDOPTERA)

By JOHN G. FRANCLEMONT

(*United States Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)288)

(Extract from a letter dated 18th September 1952)

In Part 10 of volume 6 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* just received, I note a number of requests for use of the Plenary Powers of the Commission by Dr. Paclt. I am submitting the following comments on them.

*Dr. Paclt's application Z.N.(S.)*288 (*pp.* 313-314)

Dr. Paclt's remarks about *Sericaria* are, I think, incorrect. The name was first used in the vernacular Sericaire [sic !], by Latreille in 1825 (*Familles naturelles du Règne Animal*, p. 474) in a descriptive key, but the name is coupled with *Notodonte* [sic !] without any means given for separating them. The Berthold 1827 work (Latreille's *Naturlich Familien des Thierrichs*) is merely a translation into German of the Latreille 1825 work. On page 480 we find the same key, the same coupling of the two names, but now in the Latin form as *Notodonta* and *Sericaria* [sic !] There are no included species in either case. Since no way is provided to distinguish *Notodonta* from *Sericaria*, I do not regard the Berthold " proposal " of the name as falling within the meaning and intent of the *Règles* and *Opinions*. *Sericaria* is defined by Latreille in Cuvier, 1829 (*Le Règne Animal*, ed. 2, vol. **5**, p. 404), and there he includes a single species, " *Bombyx dispar* Fabricius," the Gypsy Moth.

COMMENT ON DR. JIŘÍ PACLT'S PROPOSAL RELATING TO THE GENERIC NAME " PYRALIS " FABRICIUS, 1775 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER LEPIDOPTERA)

By JOHN G. FRANCLEMONT

(*United States Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)331)

(Extract from a letter dated 18th September 1952)

In Part 10 of volume 6 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* just received, I note a number of requests for use of the Plenary Powers of the Commission by Dr. Paclt. I am submitting the following comments on them.

*Dr. Paclt's application Z.N.(S.)*331 (*pp.* 314-315)

I have commented elsewhere (1952, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **6** : 310) that *Pyralis* Fabricius, 1775, is equal to *Tortrix* Linnaeus, 1758, and that it does not contain *farinalis*, the species that Dr. Paclt would have the Commission declare as type species.

SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSALS SUBMITTED BY DR. LAURENCE M. KLAUBER REGARDING THE TRIVIAL NAMES " ATROX " BAIRD AND GIRARD, 1853 (AS PUBLISHED IN THE COMBINATION " CROTALUS ATROX ") AND " POLYSTICTA " COPE, 1865 (AS PUBLISHED IN THE COMBINATION " CAUDISONA POLYSTICTA ") RESPECTIVELY (CLASS REPTILIA, ORDER SQUAMATA)

By HOWARD K. GLOYD

(*The Chicago Academy of Sciences, Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.*)

(Commission's references Z.N.(S.)523 and 524)

(Letter dated 29th May 1952)

I am writing to express my opinion on the following two cases of nomenclature of rattlesnakes submitted to the Commission by Dr. L. M. Klauber :—

(1) *Crotalus cinereous* Le Conte *in* Hallowell, 1852, versus *Crotalus atrox* Baird & Girard, 1853 ; and

(2) *Crotalus multimaculatus* Jan, 1863, versus *Crotalus polystictus* (Cope, 1865).

In regard to the first, I still hold the opinion expressed in my paper of 1940 on the rattlesnakes (*Chicago Acad. Sci.*, Special Publ. **4** : 205, footnote). I do not think the first publication of the " name " *cinereous* was intended as a specific name, but rather as a descriptive adjective. In addition to this, the dropping of *atrox* Baird & Girard after nearly a hundred years of unquestioned application should be avoided, if possible.

I have not personally studied the question of *multimaculatus* versus *polystictus*, but I have read Dr. Klauber's discussion of the case with care and am quite content to accept his recommendations.

SUPPORT FOR DR. LAURENCE M. KLAUBER'S PROPOSALS FOR THE USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO VALIDATE THE TRIVIAL NAMES " ATROX " BAIRD & GIRARD, 1853, AS PUBLISHED IN THE COMBINATION " CROTALUS ATROX," AND " POLYSTICTA " COPE, 1865, AS PUBLISHED IN THE COMBINATION " CAUDISONA POLYSTICTA " (CLASS REPTILIA)

By C. B. PERKINS

(*Zoological Society of San Diego, Balboa Park, San Diego, California, U.S.A.*)

(Commission's references Z.N.(S.)523 (" atrox ") and Z.N.(S.)524 (" polysticta "))

(Letter dated 9th April 1952)

(For the applications concerned, see 1952, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 6 : 234-236 and 236-238 respectively)

I think L. M. Klauber is correct in his contention that *Crotalus cinereous* antedates *Crotalus atrox* and also that *Crotalus multimaculatus* is the correct name for the snake now known as *Crotalus polystictus.*

However, *Crotalus atrox* and *Crotalus polystictus* have been used for many years. Changing the names would cause confusion. Therefore, I believe the Commission should place *Crotalus atrox* and *Crotalus polystictus* on the *Official List* and place *Crotalus cinereous* and *Crotalus multimaculatus* on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Names.*

SUPPORT FOR DR. LAURENCE M. KLAUBER'S PROPOSALS FOR THE USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO VALIDATE THE TRIVIAL NAMES " ATROX " BAIRD & GIRARD, 1853, AS PUBLISHED IN THE COMBINATION " CROTALUS ATROX," AND " POLYSTICTA " COPE, 1865, AS PUBLISHED IN THE COMBINATION " CAUDISONA POLYSTICTA " (CLASS REPTILIA)

By EDWARD H. TAYLOR

(*University of Kansas, Department of Zoology, Lawrence, Kansas, U.S.A.*)

(Commission's references Z.N.(S.)523 (" atrox ") and Z.N.(S.)524 (" polysticta "))

(Letter dated 16th April 1952)

(For the applications concerned, see 1952, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 6 : 234-236 and 236-238 respectively)

I have recently received from Dr. L. M. Klauber two propositions :—

(1) The Case Z.N.(S.)523 of
Crotalus cinereous Le Conte *in* Hallowell, 1852, versus
Crotalus atrox Baird and Girard, 1853, and

(2) The Case Z.N.(S.)524 of
Crotalus multimaculatus Jan, 1863, versus
Crotalus polystictus (Cope), 1865.

I heartily concur in Dr. Klauber's proposals. These are the names that Dr. Hobart M. Smith and Taylor used in their work " An Annotated Checklist and Key to the Snakes of Mexico."

I heartily trust that the Commission will accept the proposals.

SUPPORT FOR THE GANS/LOVERIDGE PROPOSAL FOR THE USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO VALIDATE THE GENERIC NAME "DASYPELTIS" WAGLER, 1830 (CLASS REPTILIA)

By HOBART M. SMITH

(*University of Illinois, Department of Zoology, Urbana, Illinois, U.S.A.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)660)

(Letter dated 22nd September 1952)

Inasmuch as *Dasypeltis* Wagler, 1830, is a name rather widely referred to in zoological literature, as applying to an odd genus of peculiarly adapted egg-eating snakes, I am of the opinion that the proposal by Gans and Loveridge (1952, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 6 : 347-348) for the validation by the Commission of this name in this sense should be upheld.

SUPPORT FOR THE USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO VALIDATE THE GENERIC NAME "DASYPELTIS" WAGLER, 1830, AND TO DETERMINE THE IDENTITY OF THE SPECIES TO WHICH THE TRIVIAL NAME "SIMUS" LINNAEUS, 1767 (AS PUBLISHED IN THE COMBINATION "COLUBER SIMUS") SHOULD BE APPLIED (CLASS REPTILIA)

By JAMES A. OLIVER

(*Curator of Reptiles, New York Zoological Society, Zoological Park, New York*)

(Commission references Z.N.(S.)660 ("Dasypeltis") and Z.N.(S.)662 ("simus")

(Letter dated 22nd October 1952)

(For the applications concerned, see 1952, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 6 : 347-348 and 354-355 respectively)

I am writing to support two recent requests for use of the plenary powers of the International Commission in regard to the nomenclature of Reptiles. I believe that both of these proposals are desirable from the standpoint of nomenclatorial stability. Both proposals apply to well-known forms and involve names that have been long in use. The proposals in question are :—

(1) Validation of the generic name *Dasypeltis* Wagler, 1830, for the African Egg-eating Snake, by Carl Gans and Arthur Loveridge (Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)660).

(2) Determination of the species to which the trivial name *simus* Linnaeus, 1767, as published in the combination *Coluber simus*, is to be applied, by Richard A. Edgren (Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)662).

I am in complete agreement with all of the requests made under each of these proposals.

SUPPORT FOR DR. RICHARD A. EDGREN'S PROPOSAL FOR THE USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO DETERMINE THE APPLICATION OF THE TRIVIAL NAME "SIMUS" LINNAEUS, 1767 (AS PUBLISHED IN THE COMBINATION "COLUBER SIMUS") (CLASS REPTILIA)

By HOBART M. SMITH

(*University of Illinois, Department of Zoology, Urbana, Illinois, U.S.A.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)662)

(Letter dated 22nd September 1952)

In view of the stability which the trivial name *simus* Linnaeus, 1867 (as published in the binominal combination *Coluber simus*) has enjoyed for such a long period and likewise in view of the acknowledged power of the Commission to associate any name with any species under justifiable circumstances, in my opinion the recommendation by Edgren (1952, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 6 : 354-355) that the Commission perpetuate this name in the present application should be upheld.

SUPPORT FOR MR. RICHARD EDGREN'S PROPOSAL FOR THE USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS IN CONNECTION WITH THE TRIVIAL NAME "SIMUS" LINNAEUS, 1767, AS PUBLISHED IN THE COMBINATION "COLUBER SIMUS" (CLASS REPTILIA)

By KARL P. SCHMIDT and CLIFFORD H. POPE
(*Chicago Natural History Museum, Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)662)

(Letter dated 9th October 1952)

We are entirely in favour of Mr. Richard Edgren's proposal for action to confirm the current usage of the names *Heterodon simus* and *Heterodon platyrhinos* and to place the trivial names *simus* and *platyrhinos* on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology*. This refers to your Z.N.(S.)662 (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **6** : 354-355).

SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO DETERMINE THE SPECIES TO WHICH THE TRIVIAL NAME "SIMUS" LINNAEUS, 1767 (AS PUBLISHED IN THE COMBINATION "COLUBER SIMUS" SHOULD APPLY (CLASS REPTILIA))

By LAURENCE M. KLAUBER
(*San Diego, California, U.S.A.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)662)

(Letter dated 15th October 1952)

I have reviewed the proposal set forth by Richard A. Edgren (*Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. **6**, p. 354) with regard to the allocation of certain trivial names in the genus *Heterodon*. I am fully in agreement with his proposal, believing that it will eliminate future confusion that would otherwise be inevitable.

SUPPORT FOR DR. J. WYATT DURHAM'S PROPOSAL FOR THE USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO VALIDATE THE GENERIC NAME "MELLITA" AS FROM AGASSIZ, 1841 (CLASS ECHINOIDEA)

By H. ENGEL
(*Zoologisch Museum, Amsterdam, The Netherlands*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)677)

(Letter dated 1st September 1952)

I fully agree with the proposal (Z.N.(S.)677) of J. Wyatt Durham (1952, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **6** : 359-360) to validate the generic name *Mellita* (Class Echinoidea) as from Agassiz, 1841, under the plenary powers.

PURCHASED
21

Contents

(*continued from front wrapper*)

Notices prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology

Page

Date of commencement by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of voting on applications published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* 109

Notice of the possible use by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of its plenary powers in certain cases 109

Obituary

James Lee Peters, 1889-1952 111

New Applications

(1) Proposed use of the plenary powers to correct an erroneous entry relating to the name *Astacus* Pallas, 1772 (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda) made in the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* in *Opinion* 104. By Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E., *Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* 113

(2) Proposed use of the plenary powers to validate the name *Favus* Lanchester, 1900 (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda) (proposed correction of an error in *Opinion* 73). By Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E., *Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature* 119

(3) Proposed addition of the generic names *Portunus* Weber, 1795, and *Macropipus* Prestandrea, 1833 (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda) to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*. By L. B. Holthuis (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The Netherlands*) 122

(4) Proposed use of the plenary powers to validate the trivial name *flavipes* Olivier, 1795 (as published in the combination *Dytiscus flavipes*) (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera). By J. Balfour-Browne (*Department of Entomology, British Museum (Natural History), London*) 128

Comments on applications already received

(5) *Astacus* Fabricius, 1775 : comment by L. B. Holthuis (*Leiden, The Netherlands*) 118

(6) *Favus* Lanchester, 1900 : comments by : (1) L. B. Holthuis (*Leiden, The Netherlands*) ; (2) M. F. W. Tweedie (*Singapore*) ; (3) I. Gordon (*London*) ; (4) Heinrich Balss (*München, Germany*) 121

(7) *Portunus* Weber, 1795 : comment by Fenner A. Chace, Jr. (*Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*) 127

(8) *Acmea/Acmaea* problem : comments by (1) A. Myra Keen & Siemon Muller (*Stanford, California, U.S.A.*) ; (2) Avery R. Test (*Ann. Arbor, Michigan, U.S.A.*) 130

(9) Problem of trivial names of the *adippe/cydippe/niobe* complex : comments by : (1) B. J. Lempke (*Amsterdam, The Netherlands*) ; (2) Jiri Paclt (*Bratislava, Czechoslovakia*) ; (3) Felix Bryk (*Stockholm, Sweden*) ; (4) B. C. S. Warren (*Folkestone, England*) ; (5) Wm. T. M. Forbes (*Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*) ; (6) F. Martin Brown (*Colorado Springs, Colorado, U.S.A.*) ; (7) Henry Beuret (*Neuewelt, Basle, Switzerland*) ; (8) Francis Hemming (*London*) ; (9) Ernest L. Bell (*Flushing, N.Y., U.S.A.*) ; (10) Eugene Munroe (*Ottawa, Canada*) ; (11) Elli Franz (*Frankfurt a. M., Germany*) ; (12) Ernest Mayr (*New York*) ; (13) Karl P. Schmidt (*Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.*) ; (14) Bryant Mather (*Jackson, Mississippi, U.S.A.*) ; (15) T. N. Freeman (*Ottawa, Canada*) 131

Contents

(*continued from overleaf*)

Page

(10) Trivial name *plexippus* Linnaeus, 1758 (*Papilio*); comments by: (1) Bryant Mather (*Jackson, Mississippi, U.S.A.*); (2) T. N. Freeman (*Ottawa, Canada*); (3) F. Martin Brown (*Colorado Springs, Colorado, U.S.A.*); (4) Eugene Munroe (*Ottawa, Canada*); (5) L. P. Grey (*Lincoln, Maine, U.S.A.*); (6) Karl P. Schmidt (*Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.*) 138

(11) Trivial name *dentatus* Diesing, 1839 (*Stephanurus*): comments by: (1) Allen McIntosh (*Beltsville, Maryland, U.S.A.*); (2) John M. Lucker (*Beltsville, Maryland, U.S.A.*); (3) Harold W. Manter (*Lincoln, Nebraska, U.S.A.*); (4) Robert Ph.Dollfus (*Paris*) 141

(12) *Mytilus* Linnaeus, 1758: comment by Joseph P. E. Morrison (*Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*) 144

(13) *Sphinx* Linnaeus, 1758: comment by John G. Franclemont (*Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*) 144

(14) *Diloba* Boisduval, 1840: comment by John G. Franclemont (*Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*) 145

(15) *Gryphaea* Lamarck, 1801: comments furnished by P. Korringa (*Bergen op Zoom, The Netherlands*) on behalf of the Shellfish Sub-Committee, International Council for the Exploration of the Sea 145

(16) *Phalaena* Linnaeus, 1758, and the terms used by Linnaeus to denote groups of species of that genus: comments by: (1) Jiri Paclt (*Bratislava, Czechoslovakia*); (2) Wm. T. M. Forbes (*Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*); (3) John G. Franclemont (*Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*); (4) Frederick H. Rindge (*New York*); (5) A. Diakonoff (*Leiden, The Netherlands*); (6) Francis Hemming (*London*); (7) Cyril F. dos Passos (*Mendham, N.J., U.S.A.*) .. 147

(17) *Bombyx* Fabricius, 1775: comment by John G. Franclemont (*Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*) 154

(18) *Pyralis* Fabricius, 1775: comment by John G. Franclemont (*Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*) 155

(19) Trivial name *atrox* Baird & Girard, 1853 (*Crotalus*): comments by: (1) Howard K. Gloyd (*Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.*); (2) C. B. Perkins (*San Diego, California, U.S.A.*); (3) Edward H. Taylor (*Lawrence, Kansas, U.S.A.*) 155

(20) Trivial name *polysticta* Cope, 1865 (*Caudisona*): comments by: (1) Howard K. Gloyd (*Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.*); (2) C. B. Perkins (*San Diego, California, U.S.A.*); (3) Edward H. Taylor (*Lawrence, Kansas, U.S.A.*) 155

(21) *Dasypeltis* Wagler, 1830: comments by: (1) Hobart M. Smith (*Urbana, Illinois, U.S.A.*); (2) James A. Oliver (*New York*) 157

(22) Trivial name *simus* Linnaeus, 1767 (*Coluber*); comments by: (1) James A. Oliver (*New York*); (2) Hobart M. Smith (*Urbana, Illinois, U.S.A.*); (3) Karl P. Schmidt & Clifford H. Pope (*Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.*); (4) Laurence M. Klauber (*San Diego, California, U.S.A.*) 157

(23) *Mellita*, as from Agassiz, 1841: comment by H. Engel (*Amsterdam, The Netherlands*) 158

Printed in Great Britain by Metchim and Son Ltd., Westminster, London

VOLUME 9. Part 6
pp. 159-190

17 MAY 1954
PURCHASED

11*th May* 1954

THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

The Official Organ of

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Edited by

FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

CONTENTS:

Notices prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology: Page

Date of commencement by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of voting on applications published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* 159

Notice of the possible use by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of its Plenary Powers in certain cases 159

(*continued on back wrapper*)

LONDON:

Printed by Order of the International Trust for
Zoological Nomenclature
and
Sold on behalf of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
by the International Trust
at its Publications Office,
41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.
1954

Price Twelve Shillings and Sixpence

(*All rights reserved*)

BRITISH MUSEUM

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

A. The Officers of the Commission

Honorary Life President : Dr. Karl Jordan (*British Museum* (*Natural History*), *Zoological Museum, Tring, Herts., England*)

President : Professor James Chester Bradley (*Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*) (12th August 1953)

Vice-President : Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (*Sao Paulo, Brazil*) (12th August 1953)

Secretary : Mr. Francis Hemming (*London, England*) (27th July 1948)

B. The Members of the Commission

(*Arranged in order of precedence by reference to date of election or of most recent re-election, as prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology*)

Professor H. Boschma (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The Netherlands*) (1st January 1947)
Senor Dr. Angel Cabrera (*Eva Peron, F.C.N.G.R., Argentina*) (27th July 1948)
Mr. Francis Hemming (*London, England*) (27th July 1948) (*Secretary*)
Dr. Joseph Pearson (*Tasmanian Museum, Hobart, Tasmania, Australia*) (27th July 1948)
Dr. Henning Lemche (*Universitetets Zoologiske Museum, Copenhagen, Denmark*) (27th July 1948)
Professor Teiso Esaki (*Kyushu University, Fukuoka, Japan*) (17th April 1950)
Professor Pierre Bonnet (*Université de Toulouse, France*) (9th June 1950)
Mr. Norman Denbigh Riley (*British Museum* (*Natural History*) *London*) (9th June 1950)
Professor Tadeusz Jaczewski (*Institute of Zoology, Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw, Poland*) (15th June 1950)
Professor Robert Mertens (*Natur-Museum u. Forschungs-Institut Senckenberg, Frankfurt a. M., Germany*) (5th July 1950)
Professor Erich Martin Hering (*Zoologisches Museum der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Germany*) (5th July 1950)
Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (*S. Paulo, Brazil*) (12th August 1953) (*Vice-President*)
Professor J. R. Dymond (*University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada*) (12th August 1953)
Professor J. Chester Bradley (*Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*) (12th August 1953) (*President*)
Professor Harold E. Vokes (*Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, U.S.A.*) (12th August 1953)
Professor Béla Hankó (*Békéscsaba, Hungary*) (12th August 1953)
Dr. Norman R. Stoll (*Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, New York, N.Y., U.S.A.*) (12th August 1953)
Mr. P. C. Sylvester-Bradley (*Sheffield University, Sheffield, England*) (12th August 1953)
Dr. L. B. Holthuis (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The Netherlands*) (12th August 1953)

BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Volume 9, Part 6 (pp. 159-190) 11th May 1954

NOTICES PRESCRIBED BY THE INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ZOOLOGY

The following notices are given in pursuance of decisions taken, on the recommendation of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4**: 51–56, 57–59), by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, July 1948 (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **5** : 5–13, 131).

(a) Date of commencement by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of voting on applications published in the " Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature "

Notice is hereby given that normally the International Commission will start to vote upon applications published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* on the expiry of a period of six calendar months from the date of publication in the *Bulletin* of the applications in question. Any specialist who may desire to comment upon any of the applications published in the present Part (Vol. 9, Part 6) of the *Bulletin* is accordingly invited to do so in writing to the Secretary to the Commission, as quickly as possible and in any case, in sufficient time to enable the communication in question to reach the Secretariat of the Commission before the expiry of the six-month period referred to above.

(b) Notice of the possible use by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of its Plenary Powers in certain cases

Notice is hereby given that the possible use by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of its Plenary Powers is involved in

Notices prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology (*continued*)

applications published in the present Part of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* in relation to the following names :—

(1) *immigrans* Sturtevant, 1921, as published in the combination *Drosophila immigrans* (Cl. Insecta, Order Diptera), validation of (Z.N.(S.)711) ;

(2) *pruni* Geoffroy, 1762, as published in the combination *Aphis pruni* (Cl. Insecta, Order Hemiptera), validation of (Z.N.(S.)428) ;

(3) *Lachnus* Burmeister, 1835, and *Cinara* Westwood, 1835, designation of type species for, in harmony with accustomed usage (Cl. Insecta, Order Hemiptera) (Z.N.(S.)174).

2. Comments received in sufficient time will be published in the *Bulletin* : other comments, provided that they are received within the prescribed period of six calendar months from the date of publication of the present Part, will be laid before the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at the time of commencement of voting on the application concerned.

3. In accordance with the procedure agreed upon at the Session held by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in Paris in 1948 (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 56), corresponding Notices have been sent to the serial publications " Nature " and " Science."

FRANCIS HEMMING,

Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

28 Park Village East, Regent's Park,
London, N.W.1, England.

11*th May* 1954.

PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO SUPPRESS THE SPECIFIC NAME "BROUNI" HUTTON, 1901, AS PUBLISHED IN THE COMBINATION "DROSOPHILA BROUNI," FOR THE PURPOSE OF PRESERVING THE SPECIFIC NAME "IMMIGRANS" STURTEVANT, 1921, AS PUBLISHED IN THE COMBINATION "DROSOPHILA IMMIGRANS" (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER DIPTERA)

Joint Application by :—

ERNST MAYR
(*Curator, Whitney-Rothschild Collection, The American Museum of Natural History, New York*)

J. T. PATTERSON
(*Professor of Zoology, University of Texas, Austin, Texas*)

MARSHALL P. WHEELER
(*Assistant Professor of Zoology, University of Texas, Austin, Texas*)

WARREN P. SPENCER
(*Professor of Biology, College of Wooster, Ohio*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)711)

The purpose of the present application is to ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to use its Plenary Powers to suppress the name *brouni* Hutton, 1901, as published in the combination *Drosophila brouni*, for the purpose of preserving the well-known name *immigrans* Sturtevant, 1921, as published in the combination *Drosophila immigrans*. The facts of this case are set out below.

2. In a recent study of New Zealand DROSOPHILIDAE (1952, *Trans. Proc. Roy. Soc. New Zealand* **79** : 514-515), Roy A. Harrison proposes to place the name *Drosophila immigrans* Sturtevant, 1921 (*Carnegie Inst. Washington*, Publ. No. **301** : 83) in the synonymy of *Drosophila brouni* Hutton, 1901 (*Trans. New Zealand Inst.* **33** : 91). The present applicants believe that to accept this proposal would greatly disturb uniformity and stability of zoological nomenclature, particularly since the zoological identity of the species on which these names are based is by no means unequivocally established. Any action on these names must take the following facts into consideration.

3. The original description of *Drosophila brouni* Hutton is taxonomically worthless. It does not contain a single statement that would permit identification of the nominal species *Drosophila brouni* as a member of the *D. immigrans* group, or even of the genus *Drosophila*.

4. The type specimen of *D. brouni* is still in existence (Harrison, 1952), but it is a female. Females in several species in the *Drosophila immigrans* group cannot be distinguished on the basis of a study of external characters, even when they are alive, much less on the basis of a single, old, dried, pinned specimen.

5. There are fifteen to twenty names available for presumed *immigrans*-like species in the Pacific area. The group has not yet been monographed, nor genetically or cytologically analysed. No one knows how many species there really are or what their proper names are. The Pacific appears to be the centre of diversity of this group.

6. The type specimen of *Drosophila brouni* was collected more than fifty years ago. Although flies have recently been caught in New Zealand which produce fertile offspring with U.S. *Drosophila immigrans* and presumably belong to this species, this does not prove that they belong to the same species-population as the type specimen of *Drosophila brouni* Hutton. It is not known how many members of the Pacific *immigrans*-group may occasionally reach New Zealand, and, in view of the rapid changes in the New Zealand biota, it is possible that different species of *Drosophila* were predominant fifty years ago than are now.

7. The name *immigrans* is not only the name of a well-known species, but it is also the " type species " of an important subdivision of the genus *Drosophila*, " The *immigrans* group of species." A revision of this group is now in progress and it is possible that the nominal species *Drosophila immigrans* Sturtevant will be found to be a composite of several sibling species. Nevertheless, the name *immigrans* ought to be preserved for a species of this important group, regardless of the ultimate taxonomic definition of the species *Drosophila immigrans* Sturtevant. If necessary, an explanatory note should be added to the entry on the *Official List* of the name *immigrans* Sturtevant, as soon as the species so named has been fully defined.

8. The name *Drosophila immigrans* is universally known in the biological literature and has been used in literally hundreds of papers. For the entire period since 1921 during which the species has been studied in genetics no name other than *immigrans* has been used for it. The name *immigrans* is thus so firmly in the biological literature that it would be confusing in the extreme to replace it by the name *brouni*, aside from the many above-mentioned uncertainties regarding the species to which the latter name applies.

9. The present applicants accordingly petition the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to use its Plenary Powers to prevent the discard of the universally known name *immigrans* Sturtevant by suppressing the name *brouni* Hutton. The action which the International Commission is now asked to take is that it should :—

(1) use its Plenary Powers to suppress the name *brouni* Hutton, 1901, as published in the combination *Drosophila brouni*, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy ;

(2) place the foregoing name on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology ;*

(3) place the name *immigrans* Sturtevant, 1921, as published in the combination *Drosophila immigrans*, on the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.*

PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO VALIDATE THE SPECIFIC NAME "PRUNI" GEOFFROY, 1762, AS PUBLISHED IN THE COMBINATION " APHIS PRUNI " (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER HEMIPTERA)

By F. C. HOTTES
(*Grand Junction, Colorado, U.S.A.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)428)

The present application arises out of the decision taken by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in July 1948 that Geoffroy in his *Histoire abrégée des Insectes qui se trouvent aux Environs de Paris*, published in 1762, did not consistently apply the principles of binominal nomenclature and therefore that no name published in the foregoing work acquires availability under the Law of Priority in virtue of having been so published (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 366-369) and in particular from Point (2) of that decision where the International Commission agreed to consider separately, Order by Order, any cases where, as the result of the foregoing decision, names in common use were found not to be available and where therefore it was desirable that the Commission should use its Plenary Powers to validate the names in question and so to avoid the confusion and name-changing which would otherwise be unavoidable.

2. Aphid taxonomists are not affected by the foregoing decisions, so far as they relate to generic names. They are, however, very much affected as regards one specific name which was published by Geoffroy in binominal form, although in the work in question he did not apply generally the principles of binominal nomenclature. This name is *Aphis pruni* Geoffroy, 1762 (*Hist. abrég. Ins. Paris* **2** : 497). This name is of importance, because it is the oldest name which unquestionably applies to the Mealy Plum Aphid.

3. Geoffroy did not actually describe the species to which he applied the name *Aphis pruni*, but he gave a reference to Réaumur (1737, *Mém. Hist. Ins.* **9** (3) : 317) who gave an excellent description of the Mealy Plum Aphid. The name *Aphis pruni* Geoffroy is thus firmly based upon an unquestionable identification.

4. The Mealy Plum Aphid is the type species of the genus *Hyalopterus* Koch, [1854] (*Die Pflanzenläuse-Aphiden* **1** : 16). *Aphis pruni* Fabricius (an erroneous citation for *Aphis pruni* Geoffroy, since Fabricius did not publish this as a new name, merely using Geoffroy's name) having been selected as the type species of this genus by Passerini (1860, *Gli Afidi* (ed. 2) : [27]). (The name *Hyalopterus* is commonly treated as having been published in 1857, but this is incorrect. Koch's book was published in four *Hefte*, of which the last was published in 1857 and the first in 1854. The name *Hyalopterus* occurs in the first *Heft* and should therefore be dated 1854.)

5. The Mealy Plum Aphid has been known under a large number of different specific names, its nomenclature having been exceptionally unstable. Smith (L.M.) (1936, *Hilgardia* **10** (7) : 167-209), who applied the name *Hyalopterus pruni* (Geoffroy) to this species, made a careful review of the literature relating to this species, in the introduction to which he wrote : " The scientific name of this species has been changed repeatedly ; in fact, if each of the following authors is recognised, the status of the name has been changed twenty-one times, in the course of which the species has been described eight times as new. This review of the taxonomy does not include many of the lesser notes of an economic nature, which give *Hyalopterus arundinis* (Fabr.) priority over *H. pruni* (Fabr.) and *vice versa*." It will be immediately evident, therefore, how urgent it is that the name to be applied to this important economic insect should be stabilised without further delay.

6. If the name *Aphis pruni* Geoffroy, 1762, were not now to be validated by the International Commission under the procedure foreshadowed at its Paris Session, it would be necessary to consider the question of the name *Aphis arundinis* Fabricius, 1775 (*Syst. Ent.* : 734). After giving this species the foregoing binominal name in the manner adopted throughout this work (i.e. with the generic name at the head of the page and the specific name in the margin opposite the description), Fabricius referred to this species as *Aphis arundinis epigeios*, giving its habitat as " *Habitat in arundinis epigeios foliis* " and completing the description of this species with a short Latin diagnosis. Although in the past this nominal species has frequently been identified with the Mealy Plum Aphid, it is by no means established that this identification is correct. In particular, it must be noted that Fabricius gave *Arundo epigeios* as the host species of *Aphis arundinis* and that this plant, as Börner (1932, *Anz. Schädlingsk.* **8** (8) : 8-11) has shown, is a hard-leaved sandgrass belonging to the group Agrostideae, which is not at all closely related to the group Festuceae, to which belong the only known alternate host plants of the Mealy Plum Aphid. In spite of repeated search on plants of *Calamagrostis epigeios* (the currently accepted scientific name of the host species cited by Fabricius), Börner was unable to find the Mealy Plum Aphid on this species. For this reason and because of the nature of the plant, Börner concluded that it was not a host plant for this species. Smith (L.M.) (1936, *Hilgardia* **10** (7) : 196-203), after a most careful study of the host plants of this species, concluded (: 201) that *Calamagrostis epigeios* must be rejected as a host plant of the Mealy Plum Aphid.

7. For so long as any doubt remains regarding the identity of the species represented by the nominal species *Aphis arundinis* Fabricius, 1775, it would be undesirable in the highest degree to allow a situation to arise in which it could be claimed that the specific name *arundinis* Fabricius, 1775, is the oldest available specific name for the Mealy Plum Aphid, for there would always be the danger that later work might show that this name was not applicable to that species and, in consequence, that still another change would need to be made in the name to be used for this species. The extreme importance of providing a stable nomenclature for this species arises not only from the economic problems involved, wherever this species occurs, but also from its wide distribution. The importance of this latter factor is well brought out in the following passage in which Smith (L.M.) (1936, *loc. cit.* **10** (7) : 170-171) has shown how extremely widespread is this species : " *Hyalopterus pruni* (Geoff.) has been frequently reported in many sections of the world, and particularly in the north temperate zone. It has been reported in Africa (Union of South Africa), Australia, Belgium, Canada, China, Denmark, Egypt, England, France, Germany, India, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Java, Latvia, Morocco, New Zealand, Norway, Palestine, Peru, Portugal, Russia, Scotland, Slavonia, Sweden and Switzerland . . . In the United States this species was first reported from the vicinity of Carmel, California, in 1881. It was reported in Minnesota in 1885. At present it is known to occur in California, Colorado, Connecticut, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Maine, Minnesota, Nebraska, Nevada, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, South Dakota and Utah."

8. In view of the economic importance of the Mealy Plum Aphid, it is essential that there should be no room for doubt regarding its correct specific name. The specific name now accepted for this species is *pruni* Geoffroy, 1762, as published in the combination *Aphis pruni*, but, as is now clear, that is not an available name, unless the International Commission steps in to make it so, by validating it under its Plenary Powers under the procedure envisaged in Paris in 1948. It is very important that the International Commission should intervene in this way, for confusion extending far outside the limits of systematic zoology would inevitably follow if it were necessary now to discard the specific name *pruni* Geoffroy, 1762. The risk of confusion and instability is always great when the name of an important economic species is changed for purely technical nomenclatorial reasons (such as those involved in the present instance) but the risk of such confusion and instability is greatly enhanced in the present instance by reason of the fact that, as explained in paragraph 6 above, the next oldest name after *pruni* Geoffroy, 1762, that has to be considered is a name (*arundinis* Fabricius, 1775, published in the binominal combination *Aphis arundinis*) applied to a species which cannot be identified with certainty with the Mealy Plum Aphid. Thus, if no action were to be taken by the International Commission, finality could not be obtained regarding the correct name to be applied to this species.

9. It is for the purpose of eliminating these dangers and avoiding these uncertainties that the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is now asked :—

(1) under the procedure agreed upon by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 1948, for adoption in the case of names in common use that might be found to be invalid, consequent upon the substitution of the expression "nomenclature binominal" for the expression "nomenclature binaire" in Article 25, to use its Plenary Powers to validate the specific name *pruni* Geoffroy, 1762 (as published in the combination *Aphis pruni* and as interpreted by the reference given by Geoffroy to the description published by Réaumur in 1737 (*Mém. Hist. Ins.* **9** (3) : 317)) ;

(2) to place on the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* the specific name *pruni* Geoffroy, 1762, as published in the combination *Aphis pruni* and as interpreted by the reference to Réaumur (1737) specified by Geoffroy, as proposed, under (1) above, to be validated under the Plenary Powers ;

(3) to place on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* the generic name *Hyalopterus* Koch, 1854 (type species, by selection by Passerini (1860) : *Aphis pruni* Geoffroy, 1762).

PROPOSED ADDITION TO THE "OFFICIAL LIST OF SPECIFIC NAMES IN ZOOLOGY" OF THE SPECIFIC NAME "PINI" LINNAEUS, 1758, AS PUBLISHED IN THE BINOMINAL COMBINATION "APHIS PINI" AND AS INTERPRETED BY DE GEER (1773) (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER HEMIPTERA)

By F. C. HOTTES
(*Grand Junction, Colorado, U.S.A.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)547)

I. Introductory

In the present application I examine the various discordant ways in which the nominal species *Aphis pini* Linnaeus, 1758, has been interpreted by subsequent authors and draw attention to the first occasion subsequent to Linnaeus (1758) on which a reviser definitely established the identity of the taxonomic species represented by the nominal species *Aphis pini* Linnaeus, 1758, and ask that the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should now place the specific name *pini* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binominal combination *Aphis pini*, as applied to the species referred to above, on the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology*. That an authoritative decision should be given on the foregoing question is of importance not only for the purpose of stabilising the manner in which the nominal species *Aphis pini* Linnaeus should be interpreted, but also from the wider point of view of determining the identity of the species commonly regarded as the type species of the genus *Cinara* Curtis, 1835, a subject on which also I have submitted an application to the International Commission (Z.N.(S.)174).

2. Before approaching the main subject of the present application, it is necessary to dispose of a preliminary matter relating to the status of the name *Aphis pini* Linnaeus, 1758 (*Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 453). Linnaeus there gave no verbal description of this species, beyond saying "*A. Pini sylvestris*" and adding "Habitat in Pino sylvestri." As will be seen a large part of the discussion which has since taken place regarding the identity of the Linnean species has turned on the impossibility of determining which of the several species which live on *Pinus sylvestris* Linnaeus had before him when he published the name *Aphis pini*. It must however be observed at this point that, if in fact Linnaeus had done nothing more than cite the host species of his *Aphis pini*, the name *Aphis pini* Linnaeus, 1758, would have to be regarded as a *nomen nudum*, for the International Congress of Zoology have ruled (and, indeed have decided to insert provisions in the *Règles* to make it clear) that "the citation of the name of a host species . . . unaccompanied by any other particulars does not constitute an 'indication' for the purposes of Article 25" (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 256). Fortunately, however, closer inspection of the entry in the *Systema Naturae* under the name *Aphis pini* shows that Linnaeus did give some additional particulars, for he there gave a bibliographical reference, as follows, to the first edition of his own

Fauna svecica ; " *Fn. svec.* 718." Reference to the passage quoted shows that, after repeating that this species lives in " our Pinus 788," added the following words descriptive of the species itself : " Appendiculi brevissimi." The citation in 1758 of a reference to his earlier *Fauna svecica* incorporates into the 10th edition of the *Syst. Nat.* the brief description given in the *Fauna svecica* of the species named *Aphis pini* in 1758. Thus, contrary to what has commonly been stated, the name *Aphis pini* Linnaeus, 1758, is not a *nomen nudum*, but is an available name, having been published with a brief " indication."

3. It is necessary next to consider the status of a name (such as *Aphis pini* Linnaeus, 1758), which is an available name in the sense that it was published with an " indication " but which presents difficulties of interpretation, in view of the fact that the " indication " given is not sufficient, taken by itself, to make it possible to determine to which of several allied species the name should adhere. A means for determining a question of this kind has always existed in the form of Article 31 of the *Règles*, which applies to the subdivision of a composite nominal species the rules laid down in Article 30 for determining the type species of a genus, originally established without a designated or indicated type species. The interpretation of Article 31 has always been a matter of difficulty and it is fortunate, therefore, that this Article was re-written by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology at Paris in 1948 (1950. *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 73-76) and that the revision so adopted was completed by the Fourteenth International Congress of Zoology at Copenhagen in 1953 (1953, *Copenhagen Decisions zool. Nomencl.* : 72-78). It is in the light of these provisions that the position of the name *Aphis pini* Linnaeus is examined in the present application.

II. Historical account of the way in which the nominal species " Aphis pini " Linnaeus, 1758, has been interpreted

4. The first author to examine the complex of species centred around *Aphis pini* Linnaeus, 1758, was the non-binominal author De Geer (1773, *Mém. Hist. Ins.* **3** (2) (Des Pucerons): 27–39). De Geer recognised and clearly described two species, to which he gave respectively the non-binominal names *Aphis nudi pini* and *Aphis tomentosa pini*. He devoted considerable space to the description of these species and their life histories. In the case of the species which he called *Aphis nudi pini*, he described the male as being apterous. As has been pointed out to me (*in litt.*) by Dr. Ris Lambers, this is an extremely important observation, for it appears that there is only one European species of the genus *Cinara* Curtis which feeds on pine and in which the male is apterous. This is a character of critical importance, for it furnishes an indisputable criterion for identifying the species which De Geer called *Aphis nudi pini* and thus for disentangling the synonymy of this species in the later literature.

5. Goeze in 1778 (*Ent. Beytr. Linn.* **2** : 304–305) placed the name *Aphis nudi pini* De Geer, 1773, as a synonym of *Aphis pini* Linnaeus, 1758, and was thus the first author definitely to select one particular species from among those covered by the Linnean diagnosis to be the species to which the name *Aphis pini* Linnaeus should be applied.

6. Fabricius in 1781 (*Spec. Ins.* **2** : 389) adopted the same line as that of Goeze and in addition gave the binominal name *Aphis pineti* to the species which De Geer had called *Aphis tomentosa pini* in 1773. Fabricius adopted the same treatment for these species in 1794 (*Ent. syst.* **4** : 219) and in 1803 (*Syst. Rhyng* : 300).

7. Villiers (1789, *Linn. Ent.* **1** : 549), like Fabricius in 1781, realised that a binominal name was needed for the species which De Geer (1773) had called *Aphis tomentosa pini*, and, being presumably unaware of the fact that Fabricius had already given it the name *Aphis pineti*, himself gave it the new name *Aphis tomentosa*.

8. Kaltenbach in 1843 (*Mon. Fam. Pflanzenläuse* (*Phytophythires*) : 155–160) described a species of *Lachnus* Burmeister which he identified with *Aphis pini* Linnaeus. He also quoted at some length some of the observations made by De Geer in regard to his *Aphis nudi pini*. Kaltenbach incorrectly identified De Geer's species with that which he himself was considering and attributed it to Linnaeus.

9. Walker in 1848 (*Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.* (2) **2** : 102) also described a species to which he applied the name *Aphis pini* Linnaeus. The identity of the species so described by Walker was later examined by Swain (1921). See paragraph 18 below.

10. In 1855 (*Die Pflanzenläuse Aphiden* : 234–236) Koch described a species under the name *Lachnus pini*, which he attributed to Linnaeus and thus considered to be the same species as *Aphis pini* Linnaeus. The species so identified by Koch was later discussed both by Cholodkovsky (1898) and by del Guercio (1909). See paragraphs 14 and 15 below. In addition, Koch described a second species under the name *Lachnus pineti* Fabricius. Koch, however, misidentified the Fabrician species. The species which he so identified with the *pineti* of Fabricius has for the most part been incorrectly treated as having been so named by Koch. It is the species which Mordvilko, 1895 (*Zool. Anz.* **18** : 100) named *Lachnus pineus*.

11. Buckton in 1881 (*Mon. brit. Aphid.* **3** : 50) was the next author to describe a species under the specific name *pini* Linnaeus. The species so identified by Buckton was later discussed by Swain (1921). See paragraph 18 below.

12. Weed in 1890 (*Agric. Sci.* **4** (No. 6) : 157, pl. 2) described the Scotch Pine Plant-Louse under the name *Lachnus pini* (Linnaeus). His action in this matter was later commented upon by Patch (1912). See paragraph 16 below.

13. In 1895 (*Zool. Anz.* **18** : 73–85, 93–104) Mordvilko rejected the name *Aphis pini* Linnaeus and gave a new name, *Lachnus nudus* (: 99) (which however he attributed to De Geer) to the species which De Geer (1773) had called *Aphis nudi pini*. Although De Geer was not a binominal author and had never used the term *nudus* as a specific name, Mordvilko attributed that name to De Geer ; Mordvilko himself must however be regarded as the author of this name, which accordingly takes priority only from 1895. The following are the reasons given by Mordvilko for his rejection of the name *Aphis pini* Linnaeus: "Einige früher beschriebene *Lachnus* Arten konnten in der Tabelle nicht aufgenommen werden. Hauptsächlich weil ihre Beschreibungen nicht ausfürhlich sind. Diese sind folgende: *L. hyalinus* Koch, *confinis* Koch, *laricis* Koch 26, *cupressi* Buckt., *macrocephalus* Buckt. (ist höchst wahrscheinlich *L. hyalinus* Koch), *pinicola* Buckton 27, *piniphila* Ratz., 28, und *L. pini* nach Linné 29 und Fabricius 30." As the nominal species *Lachnus nudus* Mordvilko was expressly based upon the *Aphis nudi pini* of De Geer, Mordvilko was the first modern author to recognise the species *Aphis pini* Linnaeus, as defined by Goeze and Fabricius. Mordvilko, it may be noted, was aware that the males of his *Lachnus nudus* were apterous. In the same paper Mordvilko treated, as *Lachnus pini* Kaltenbach, the species which in 1843 Kaltenbach had described under that name but which that author had identified with *Aphis pini* Linnaeus (paragraph 8 above).

14. Cholodkovsky in 1898 (*Hor. Soc. ent. ross.* **31**: 7, 32, 40–41) also considered the question of the species identified by Kaltenbach (paragraph 8 above) as *Aphis pini* Linnaeus. The conclusion that he reached was that it was a species very near to *Lachnus taeniatus* Koch, 1857. Cholodkovsky added that the observations by De Geer which Kaltenbach had cited as relating to the species which he was then describing did not in fact relate to that species, but to *Lachnus nudus* De Geer [sic] [recte *Lachnus nudus* Mordvilko]. Commenting on the species which Koch (paragraph 10 above) had called *Lachnus pini* (and which he had identified with *Aphis pini* Linnaeus), Cholodkovsky expressed the opinion that the species in question was the same as that which De Geer had called *Aphis nudi pini*. Cholodkovsky did not make use of the name *Aphis pini* Linnaeus, holding, in regard to it, much the same view as that expressed by Mordvilko (1895) (see paragraph 13 above).

15. The identity of the species which Koch had described under the name *Lachnus pini* (Linnaeus) (i.e. as *Aphis pini* Linnaeus) was further discussed in 1909 (*Redia* **5** (2) 294–296) by del Guercio, who reached the same conclusion as that expressed by Cholodkovsky in 1898 (paragraph 14 above), namely that Koch's species was the *Aphis nudi pini* of De Geer.

16. In 1912 (*Maine agric. exper. Stat. Bull.* **202**: 168–169) Patch described a species, to which she applied the name *Lachnus pini*. She attributed this name to Weed, who (as we have seen in paragraph 12 above) had described the Scotch Pine Plant-Louse under this name, which however he had attributed to Linnaeus. Patch said:—"This species seems to agree with *Lachnus pineti* Koch as discussed and figured by Cholodkovsky (1898) and may prove to be that species."

17. Van den Goot in 1915 (*Beitr. Kenntn. holländisch. Blattläuse*: 405–408) did not mention *Aphis pini* Linnaeus at all. From his remarks on *Lachnus pineti* Koch, it seems likely that he included under that name the species which later Theobald identified as *pini* Linnaeus, except that he described the alate viviparous female as having only one sensorium on the third antennal segment, instead of from seven to nine.

18. Swain in 1921 (*Ent. News.* **32**: 228–229) reviewed both the *Aphis pini* Linnaeus of Walker (1848) (see paragraph 9 above) and the species, also identified with *Aphis pini* Linnaeus, described by Buckton in 1881 (see paragraph 11 above). His conclusion was that both the specimens described by Walker and those described by Buckton were referable to *Lachnus taeneatus* Koch, a species which he regarded as close to *Lachnus nudus* Mordvilko, 1895 (paragraph 13 above).

19. In 1923 (*Guide Ins. Connecticut* **4** (*Hemipt. Fam. Aphididae*) : 261-262) Wilson described the apterous and alate viviparous females of *Lachnus pineus* Mordvilko, 1895, under the name *Dilachnus pini* (Linnaeus). In this he was widely followed by later workers.

20. Davidson in 1925 (*List brit. Aphides* : 63), when discussing what he called *Lachniella pini* (L.), added the following note : "*Aphis pini* (L.) of Walker and *L. pini* of Buckton do not appear to be the same species." Swain (1921), it will be recalled (paragraph 18 above), had already expressed the view that Walker and Buckton had misidentified another species (Swain suggested *Lachnus taeniatus* Koch) with *Aphis pini* Linnaeus. From Davidson's remarks it may be concluded that the species with which he was dealing was the same as that which later Theobald (1929) was to identify with *Aphis pini* Linnaeus (paragraph 21 below), although it must be admitted that the fact that Davidson placed this species in the genus *Lachniella* (in which the media of the forewing is only once-branched) suggests otherwise.

21. In 1929 (*Plant Lice Gt. Brit.* **3** : 145-147) Theobald treated *Aphis pini* Linnaeus as a member of the genus *Panimerus* Laing, 1926 (*Entomologist* **59** : 322), a name which in a footnote Laing changed to *Neochmosis* (1929, *ibid.* **3** : 129). Of the species with which we are here concerned Theobald listed the following as synonyms : *Aphis nudi pini* De Geer, *Aphis pini* Linnaeus, *Lachnus pini* Kaltenbach, *Lachnus nudus* Mordvilko, together with others. Theobald described his species as having alate males, thus showing conclusively that the species before him was not the *Aphis nudi pini* of De Geer, the males of which are apterous (see paragraph 4 above) and consequently was not *Aphis pini* Linnaeus, as interpreted by Goeze. His description indicates that the species which he had before him was *pineus* Mordvilko. Thus, Theobald was in error not only when he cited *Aphis nudi pini* De Geer and *Lachnus nudus* Mordvilko in the synonymy of his species, but also when he so cited the *Lachnus pini* Linnaeus of Kaltenbach, 1843 (see paragraph 8 above).* The conclusion reached by Wilson (1923) (paragraph 19 above) and by Theobald (1929) exercised a considerable influence and was followed by a number of subsequent Aphid workers.

22. In a paper published in 1930 (*Proc. biol. Soc. Wash.* **43** : 185-188) I expressed the view that *Cinara nudus* (Mordvilko, 1895) was not a synonym of *Aphis pini* Linnaeus, 1758, and that the latter species was the species to which Koch (in 1855) had given the name *Lachnus pineti*.

---

* The species which Kaltenbach (1843) erroneously identified with *Aphis pini* Linnaeus (see paragraph 8 of the present paper) cannot bear the name *pini* Kaltenbach, for the *Règles* expressly provide (Article 31) that a specific name based upon a misidentification cannot be accepted as an available name. Even if this were otherwise, the species of Kaltenbach could not bear the name *pini* in the genus *Cinara* Curtis, for in that combination the name would be a junior secondary homonym of *Cinara pini* (Linnaeus). I accordingly hereby give the name **Cinara kaltenbachi** nom. nov. to the species which Kaltenbach misidentified with *Aphis pini* Linnaeus, 1758..

23. In 1930 I received two interesting letters from Mordvilko bearing on the present problem. In the first of these letters (which was dated 3rd June 1930), Mordvilko wrote: "At present it is not possible to establish what Linné meant by his *Aphis pini*. There are four to six species of *Lachnus* at least that live on the branches and shoots of *Pinus* in Europe. Under the name of *L. pini*, J. Kaltenbach, 1841-1843, described already a certain *Lachnus* species of the group *pini* (L.) Kalt., to which the following species belonged: *L. pini* K., *L. pineus* Mordv. (=*pineti* Koch *nec* Fab.), *L. hyperophilus* Koch, etc. *Lachnus nudus* Deg. is certainly quite a peculiar *Lachnus*, to which group *L. nudus* Deg., *L. taeniatus* Koch, *L. pinihabitans* Mordvilko also belong. (See Mordvilko, 1894-1895; *Zool. Anz.*, 1895; N. Cholodkovsky, *Hor. Soc. Ent. Ross.* **31**, 1898.)" In the second of the two letters (letter dated 18th July 1930) Mordvilko wrote: "Today I am sending you two glass tubes with plant lice, *Lachnus nudus* Deg. and *L. pineus* Mordv. (=*pineti* Koch) (? =*L. pini* L.). In my opinion, under the name of *A. pini*, Linné meant one of the species of the group Mordv. *pineus*, *curtiplosus*, *hyperophilus* Koch, *pini* Kalt., because *L. pineus* f.e. is the most common species. If they proved to be one and the same species, this would be called *L. pini* L." From these quotations, we see that, while Mordvilko was still inclined to question whether the *Aphis pini* of Linnaeus could be recognised, he was willing to hazard a guess that this was possible. (I may mention here that in a letter dated 4th August 1948, Dr. Ris Lambers questioned whether Mordvilko was right in thinking that *L. pineus* is the commonest species of the group. Perhaps Mordvilko thought of *L. pineus* as being the most widely spread geographically of the species concerned, as Cholodkovsky (1898) had suggested was the case.) Looking at Mordvilko's conclusion generally, we have to note that, in order to identify *Aphis pini* Linnaeus in the way that he did, he had to put out of his mind the fact that the *Aphis nudi pini* of De Geer has apterous males, while in his *pini*, which is the *pini* of Wilson and Theobald, the males are alate.

24. In 1932 (*in* Sorauer, *Handb. Pflanzen. Krankh.* (ed. 4) **5**: 568) Börner and Schilder placed the *Aphis nudi pini* of De Geer as a synonym of *Cinara pini* (Linnaeus), thus accepting Goeze's interpretation of that species.

25. In 1939 (*Arbeit. physiol. angewandt. Ent.* **6** (1): 76), however, Börner erected a new genus to which he gave the name *Cinaria*, designating, as its type species, *Cinaria kochiana* nom. nov. for *Aphis laricis* Walker, 1848 (*Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.* (2) **2**: 102). It appears that the chief characteristic of this genus is the presence of a well developed mesosternal tubercle. Lambers (1948: 275), however, has since stated that such a tubercle is present in *Cinara nudus* (Mordvilko), that is, in the true *Aphis pini* of Linnaeus. Lambers has stated also in the same place that in 1939 Börner accepted the opinion of Theobald and others who described the aphid known as *Lachnus pineus* Mordvilko under the specific name *pini* Linnaeus.

26. Oestlund in 1942 (*Syst. Aphid.*: 24) accepted the species *Lachnus pineti* Koch, as interpreted by Van den Goot (1915) (see paragraph 17 above) as being the same species as *Aphis pini* Linnaeus, 1758. However, he described the male of this species as being alate, and it is evident, therefore, that he did not have before him the true *Aphis pini* of Linnaeus, as interpreted by Goeze (see paragraph 5 above).

27. The problem with which we are concerned was posed as follows very clearly by Lambers in 1948 (*Trans. R. ent. Soc. Lond.* **99** : 274-275) : " The description of *pini* by Linné is such that it may apply to at least five species living on *Pinus silvestris*. Therefore, the name is available for any of these species. It has alternately been used for two species, one also known as *pineti* Koch or *pinea* Mordvilko, the other as *nuda* De Geer or *nuda* Mordvilko. It is clear that De Geer believed that his *Aphis nudi pini* was *pini* L. Therefore Goeze and Gmelin were in all respects correct in placing *Aphis nudi pini*, an invalid name, as a synonym of *pini* L. As De Geer describes his species so clearly that a misunderstanding has never occurred as to what he meant, we have one very clear and distinct conception of *Aphis pini* L., which has the advantage of being the oldest interpretation."

III. Conclusions and Recommendations

28. Having now examined the principal occasions on which the specific name *pini* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Aphis* pini, has been used, we may summarise our principal conclusions as follows : (1) The nominal species *Aphis pini* Linnaeus, 1758, may or may not have been a composite species but in any case its description is so scanty that it cannot be interpreted with certainty until some later author, acting under Article 31 of the *Règles*, definitely links the specific name *pini* Linnaeus to a clearly recognisable species which conforms with the description given by Linnaeus. De Geer (1773) clearly distinguished two species belonging to the *pini*-complex and it might easily be claimed that of these he definitely identified with *Aphis pini* Linnaeus the one to which he applied the non-binominal name *Aphis nudi pini*. Even if the view is taken that De Geer's action was not sufficiently precise to bring it within the scope of Article 31, there can be no question but that five years later Goeze (1778) definitely identified *Aphis nudi pini* De Geer as the species described by Linnaeus as *Aphis pini*. It can certainly be concluded therefore that, under Article 31, the above is the manner in which the nominal species *Aphis pini* Linnaeus is to be interpreted. (2) It cannot be said that over the period as a whole there has been any consistently general use of the specific name *pini* Linnaeus. In the XVIIIth Century, it may be said that *Aphis pini* Linnaeus was consistently interpreted in the correct manner ; in the XIXth Century the name *pini* Linnaeus was interpreted in a variety of inconsistent, and, in almost every case, incorrect ways, and in the last decade of the century a fresh impetus was given to the tendency to use this name in an incorrect manner through the influence exerted by Mordvilko (1895), the first modern author to recognise the species described by De Geer as *Aphis nudi pini* (=*Aphis pini* Linnaeus, 1758), who unfortunately abandoned the use of the specific name *pini* Linnaeus, giving to that species the specific name *nudus :* the XXth Century also has witnessed considerable divergence of practice ; Mordvilko's influence persisted for a considerable time until it was replaced by that of Wilson (1923) and Theobald (1929), who restored the specific name *pini* Linnaeus but unfortunately associated that name not with *Aphis nudi pini* but with the species to which Mordvilko had given the name *pineus*. In the most recent period, however, there has been a move to restore the specific name *pini* Linnaeus to its correct usage. This course was followed by Börner and Schilder (1932), by Oestlund (1942) (so far as the bibliographical references, but not the description, are concerned) and by Lambers in 1948.

29. If it had been found that there had been a preponderating use of the specific name *pini* Linnaeus for some species, other than that to which, in consequence of the action of Goeze (1778) it applies under the *Règles*, there might well have been a case for asking the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to use its Plenary Powers to set aside the selection made, under Article 31, by Goeze in 1778, and to select in its place whatever other species had commonly been accepted as being the species represented by the nominal species *Aphis pini* Linnaeus. I have carefully considered whether such a course is called for in the present case, but, in view of the history of this name, as summarised in the preceding paragraph, and having regard also to the fact that the most recent authors who have treated of these species have applied the name *pini* Linnaeus in the manner required by the selection made by Goeze in 1778, I have reached the conclusion that the use of the Plenary Powers for the purpose of setting Goeze's (1778) selection on one side would not be justified and that the course which would lead to the least confusion and inconvenience—for some is probably unavoidable—would be for the International Commission to register a definitive acceptance of Goeze's interpretation of the nominal species *Aphis pini* Linnaeus.

30. I accordingly now ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature :—

(1) to place on the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* the specific name *pini* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binominal combination *Aphis pini*, the species so named to be interpreted by reference to the description given by De Geer (1773) for *Aphis nudi pini*, as so selected by Goeze (1778) ;

(2) to place on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* the specific name *nudus* Mordvilko, 1895, as published in the binominal combination *Lachnus nudus* (the specific name of a nominal species which, being based on *Aphis nudi pini* De Geer, 1773, is objectively identical with *Aphis pini* Linnaeus, 1758, under the selection made by Goeze (1778) under Article 31).

PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO DESIGNATE, AS THE TYPE SPECIES OF "LACHNUS" BURMEISTER, 1835, AND "CINARA" CURTIS, 1835 (CLASS INSECTA,ORDER HEMIPTERA) A SPECIES IN HARMONY WITH ACCEPTED NOMENCLATORIAL PRACTICE

By F. C. HOTTES
(*Grand Junction, Colorado, U.S.A.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)174)

Much confusion has arisen among Aphid taxonomists in connection with the generic names *Lachnus* Burmeister, 1835, and *Cinara* Curtis, 1835. Both these names were first published in the same year and it has not been found possible to establish with certainty the relative priority to be assigned to them. These two nominal genera have been treated as representing the same taxonomic genus, and *Cinara* has been treated as a junior synonym of *Lachnus*, notwithstanding the fact that the priority of these names in relation to one another was not definitely established. Both genera have been treated as having the same species as their respective type species, though incorrectly so. Moreover, the name *Lachnus* has until recently been associated with a group of aphids generically different from that to which is referable the species which under the Rules is the valid type species of that genus. Furthermore, the species which was designated as the type species of *Cinara* was distinguished by the addition of a question mark inserted after the author's name, a procedure on the part of Curtis which naturally casts a cloud on the identity of the species so designated.

2. In the belief that this state of confusion should be brought to an end with as little further delay as possible, the present application has been prepared for the purpose of presenting the available facts to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and thereby of securing an authoritative ruling for the guidance of present and future taxonomists.

(a) The generic name "Lachnus" Burmeister, 1835

3. In 1835 (on a date which is not precisely known) Burmeister published his generic name *Lachnus* (*Handbuch der Entomologie* **2** : 91), which he attributed to Illiger. In this connection it is interesting to note the following statement entered in long hand at the bottom of page 91 in a copy of the second volume of Burmeister's *Handbuch* which I have examined : "Illiger never described the genus *Lachnus*, which he had put in manuscript. Burmeister adopted the name, credited it to Illiger, and described the genus." (Theo. Pergande.) This statement is similar to one sent to me in 1930 by the late Dr. Walther Horn. Both authorities agree with the generally held opinion that Illiger did not describe the genus, so that the name *Lachnus* should be credited to Burmeister. (It should be recalled at this point that in 1948 the International Congress of Zoology decided to insert in the Code a provision that, where a name has gained an irregular currency through having been in use in manuscript, that name is to be attributed to the first author by whom it is validly published with an indication and it is to rank for the purposes of priority from the date on which it is first so published—see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 259.)

4. Westwood in 1840 (**2** : 118) selected *Aphis roboris* Linnaeus, 1758 (*Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 452) as the type species of *Lachnus* Burmeister, no species having been so designated or indicated at the time of the original publication of this generic name. This selection was, however, invalid, because *Aphis roboris* Linnaeus was not one of the nominal species included in the genus *Lachnus* by Burmeister when he first published the name *Lachnus*.

5. Schumacher in 1921 (*Zool. Anz.* **53** : 185-186) attempted to establish the proposition that *Aphis roboris* Linnaeus was the type species of *Lachnus* Burmeister, by citing from the second edition of Burmeister's *Handbuch der Entomologie* (**2** : 1006), where Burmeister stated that his *Lachnus fasciatus* of 1835 (*Handb. Ent.* **2** (1) : 93) was a synonym of *Cinara roboris* (Linnaeus) and therefore became a synonym of *Aphis roboris* Linnaeus, as identified by Fabricius. It is significant that Burmeister here made use of the generic name *Cinara* and it should be noted also that he did not treat it as a synonym of *Lachnus*. This was in the year before that in which Westwood selected *Aphis roboris* Linnaeus as the type species of *Lachnus* Burmeister. However, *Aphis roboris* Linnaeus was not eligible for selection as the type species of *Lachnus* Burmeister, since it is not one of the nominal species cited by Burmeister when he first published that generic name. The fact that at a later date Burmeister treated the name *Lachnus fasciatus* Burmeister as a junior synonym of *Aphis roboris* Linnaeus is totally irrelevant for the purposes of Article 30. It does not alter in any way the fact that (as explained in paragraph 4 above) Westwood's action in 1840 in selecting *Aphis roboris* Linnaeus as the type species of *Lachnus* Burmeister was invalid.

6. In 1860 Passerini (*Gli Afidi con un Prospetti dei Generi ed alcune Specie nuova italiana* : 29) indicated that he considered that *Lachnus pinicola* Kaltenbach, 1843 (*Mon. Fam. Pflanzenläuse* : 154, 155) was typical of *Lachnus* Burmeister. It might be argued that his action on this occasion constituted a clear selection of that species as the type species (under Rule (*g*) in Article 30), but it is not necessary to consider this question in detail, for in 1863 Passerini (*Arch. Zool. Anat. Fisiol.* **2** (2) : 185) unequivocally selected the above species as the type species of *Lachnus* Burmeister. Passerini's action was however invalid, for the species (*Lachnus pinicola* Kaltenbach) was not one of the nominal species included by Burmeister in the genus *Lachnus* at the time when he first published that generic name. Kaltenbach's *pinicola* had, indeed, not even been described at that time.

7. In 1909 Mordvilko (*Annu. Mus. zool. Acad. Sci. St. Petersb.* **13** : 374) selected *Lachnus nudus* De Geer as the type species of *Lachnus* Burmeister. This selection, like those discussed above, was invalid, since the species selected was not one of those included by Burmeister at the time when he first published the generic name *Lachnus*.

8. In 1910 Wilson (*Ent. News* **21** : 151) selected *Lachnus punctatus* Burmeister, 1835, as the type species of the genus *Lachnus* Burmeister. This is one of the nominal species originally included in the genus *Lachnus* at the time when that generic name was first published and it is the first such species to have been selected as the type species of this genus. Wilson's action was therefore perfectly valid (under Rule (*g*) in Article 30) and the nominal species *Lachnus punctatus* Burmeister is therefore, under the *Règles*, the type species of the genus *Lachnus* Burmeister, 1835. It must be noted however that, at the time when Wilson made the foregoing type selection, the identity of the taxonomic species represented by the nominal species *Lachnus punctatus* Burmeister was unknown.

9. Wilson reverted to this subject in 1911 (*Ann. ent. Soc. Amer.* **4** : 51-54) in a paper in which he pointed out that there was a possibility that the species represented by the nominal species *Lachnus punctatus* Burmeister might be the same as that represented by the nominal species *Aphis viminalis* Boyer de Fanscolombe, 1841 (*Ann. Soc. ent. France* **10** (3) : 184), which Mordvilko had designated as the type species of the genus *Tuberolachnus* Mordvilko, [1909] (*Annu. Mus. zool. Acad. St. Petersb.* **13** : 374). In the light of these considerations, Wilson sought to select *Lachnus fasciatus* Burmeister, 1835 (*Handb. Ent.* **2** (1) : 93) as the type species of *Lachnus* Burmeister. Wilson's action in this matter was naturally invalid, since he himself had in 1910 validly selected *Lachnus punctatus* Burmeister as the type species of this genus. At the time when he attempted to change the type species of *Lachnus* in this way Wilson was unaware that the true identity of the species represented by the nominal species *Lachnus fasciatus* Burmeister was still unknown and he could not guess that that species would turn out to be *Aphis roboris* Linnaeus. There is little doubt that at that time Wilson interpreted the nominal species *Lachnus fasciatus* Burmeister in the same manner as del Guercio who in 1909 (*Redia* **5** (2) : 294-296) had described in considerable detail a species which he had identified with Burmeister's nominal species *Lachnus fasciatus*. Subsequent events have shown, however, that the species so identified by del Guercio with Burmeister's *fasciatus* was an entirely different species. There is therefore no doubt that, when citing the name *Lachnus fasciatus* Burmeister, as the name of the type species of the genus *Lachnus*, Wilson had in mind not the true *fasciatus* of Burmeister but a different species misidentified by him therewith. Nevertheless, under the *Règles* as clarified by the Paris Congress (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 158), his action would have constituted a valid selection of the true *Lachnus fasciatus* of Burmeister, if a valid type selection had not already been made for the genus *Lachnus*, for under the decision noted above an author is to be assumed, for the purposes of Article 30, to have correctly identified a species selected by him to be the type species of a previously established genus. This question does not however arise in the present case, since (as shown in paragraph 8 above) a different nominal species, *Lachnus punctatus* Burmeister, had already been validly selected to be the type species of the genus *Lachnus*. Most Aphid workers today identify the nominal species *Lachnus viminalis* Boyer with *Lachnus punctatus* Burmeister and accordingly treat the trivial name *viminalis* Boyer as a junior synonym of the name *punctatus* Burmeister. Further, it is now generally considered that the species represented by the nominal species *Lachnus punctatus* Burmeister is the same as that represented by the nominal species *Aphis saligna* Gmelin, 1790 (*in* Linnaeus, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 13) **1** (4) : 2209), the specific name *punctatus* Burmeister being sunk therefore as a junior synonym of the name *saligna* Gmelin. It should be noted also that some Aphid workers consider the genus *Tuberolachnus* Mordvilko, [1909], as identical with the genus *Pterochlorus* (emend. of *Pteroclorus*) Rondani, 1848 (*N. Ann. Sci. nat. Bologna* [2] **9** : 35), the type species of which is *Aphis roboris* Linnaeus (the first species to have been selected, though invalidly, as the type species of *Lachnus* Burmeister).

10. In 1913 (*Tidschr. Ent.* **56** : 153) Van der Goot selected *Aphis juniperi* De Geer, 1773 (*Mém. Hist. Ins.* **3** : 2, 156) as the type species of *Lachnus* Burmeister, but that selection was of course invalid for, quite apart from the fact that a valid type-selection (of *Lachnus punctatus* Burmeister) had already been made by Wilson in 1910. De Geer's nominal species *juniperi* was not one of Burmeister's original species. Very inconsistently, Van der Goot in the same paper (*loc. cit.* **56** : 74) cited also *Aphis nudus* De Geer, 1773, as the type species of this genus. This selection also is invalid, and for the same reasons. (It may be noted incidentally that De Geer never described a species under the above name, the name which he used being *Aphis nudi pini.*)

11. Baker in 1920 (*U.S. Dep. Agric. Bull.* **826** : 15-16), after reviewing the various type selections for the genus *Lachnus* Burmeister that had been made up to that time, came to the conclusion that the generic name *Lachnus* would be lost to Aphid workers, unless the identity of the nominal species *Lachnus punctatus* Burmeister could be established or the Rules were suspended in this case. In order to save the name *Lachnus*, Baker thereupon, in deliberate disregard of the Rules, adopted *Lachnus fasciatus* Burmeister as the type species of the genus *Lachnus*. At the same time he stated that an application would be submitted to the International Commission asking it to use its Plenary Powers to preserve the long-established use of the generic name *Lachnus*. I am informed, however, by the Secretary to the Commission that there is no trace in the archives of the Commission of any such application having been submitted. It is clear from Baker's paper that he followed del Guercio in his interpretation of the nominal species *Lachnus fasciatus* Burmeister (see paragraph 9 above) and therefore did not have in mind the true *Lachnus fasciatus* Burmeister, which (as already explained) is identical with *Aphis roboris* Linnaeus ; for he spoke of the media of the fore-wings of this species as being once-branched, whereas all known species of *Lachnus*, as universally understood, have the media of the fore-wings twice-branched. It is clear, therefore, that Baker's concept of the genus *Lachnus* Burmeister was not that of Burmeister himself or that of subsequent workers. Having accepted *Lachnus fasciatus* Burmeister, as interpreted by del Guercio, as the type species of the genus *Lachnus* Burmeister, Baker sank the generic name *Lachniella* del Guercio, [1909] (*Redia* **5** : 286) as a junior synonym of *Lachnus* Burmeister.

12. In 1931 in a paper entitled " El genotypo de *Lachnus* Burm. (Hemip. Aphid.) " Orfila (R.N.) selected *Lachnus lapidarius* (Fabricius) (=*Chermes lapidarius* Fabricius, 1803, *Syst. Rhyng.* : 306) as the type species of *Lachnus* (Orfila, 1931, *Rev. Soc. ent. argent.*, B. Aires **3** : 249-250). This is one of the species originally included in *Lachnus* by Burmeister. Schumacher in 1921 (*Zool Anz.* **53** : 182-183) gave a synonymy for *Lachnus lapidarius* (Fabricius), and came to the conclusion that the species so named was the same as *Prociphilus xylostei* De Geer, 1773. If Orfila's selection of *Chermes lapidarius* Fabricius, as identified by Schumacher with *Aphis xylostei* De Geer, as the type species of *Lachnus* were to be accepted, a new concept would be created for the nominal genus *Lachnus* Burmeister, and the name *Lachnus* would replace the name *Prociphilus* Koch, 1857 (*Die Pflanzenläuse Aphiden* **9** : 279). The objections to such a solution are obvious.

13. Börner & Schilder in 1932 (*in* Sorauer's *Handbuch der Pflanzenkrankheiten* (ed. 4) **5** : 568) considered that the species which del Guercio had identified with *Lachnus fasciatus* Burmeister was the same as *Cinara costata* (Zetterstedt).

14. It should be noted that Kaltenbach in 1843 (*Mon. Fam. Pflanzenläuse* : 148) listed both *Lachnus fasciatus* Burmeister and *Cinara roboris* (Curtis) as synonyms of *Aphis roboris* Linnaeus, 1758, which he assigned to the genus *Lachnus* Burmeister. Kaltenbach seems to have been the first author to have identified the nominal species *Lachnus fasciatus* Burmeister, 1835, with *Aphis roboris* Linnaeus, 1758, apart from Burmeister himself who in 1839 (*Handb. Ent.* **2** (2) (2) : 1006) had sunk his own specific name *fasciatus* as a synonym of *roboris* Linnaeus. For some reason which it is impossible to explain, Kaltenbach went on to describe a different species under the name *Lachnus fasciatus* and credited that name, as used in this way, to Burmeister. Kaltenbach suggested that the species which he named in this way might turn out to be the same as *Aphis costata* Zetterstedt, 1828 (*Fauna Ins. lapp.* (1) : 559).

15. In Heft 7 of his *Die Pflanzenläuse Aphiden*, published in 1855, Koch, on page 226, treated both *Lachnus fasciatus* Burmeister and the *Cinara roboris* of Curtis as synonyms of *Dryobius roboris* (Linnaeus). Having done this, he then in Heft 8, published in 1857, proceeded, on page 237, to describe a species to which he applied the name *Lachnus fasciatus* Burmeister. Under this name he gave references both to the *Handbuch* of Burmeister and to Kaltenbach, and, like Kaltenbach, he suggested that this species might be identical with *Aphis costata* Zetterstedt, 1828. Koch illustrated this species by figures of alate and apterous viviparous females. The figure of the alate female shows the media of the forewings twice-branched ; moreover, the pigmented areas characteristic of *costata* Zetterstedt are lacking. However, in his description of the alate viviparous female Koch stated that the media were only once-branched ; he referred also to the presence of pigmented areas. We may, therefore, conclude that the species which he had before him was the *costata* of Zetterstedt and not the species to which Burmeister had given the name *fasciatus*.

16. Mordvilko (1895, *Zool. Anz.* **18** : 80–102) and Cholodkovsky (1898, *Hor. Soc. ent. ross.* **31** : 48–52) took different views as to the species identified by Kaltenbach and Koch with the nominal species *Lachnus fasciatus* Burmeister. Mordvilko held that Kaltenbach's species was the same as that to which Cholodkovsky had given the name *Lachnus farinosus* (1891, *Rev. Sci. nat.* **1891** (No. 8) : 294–306) and spoke of that species as *Lachnus fasciatus* Kalt. He identified in the same way the species which Koch had identified as *Lachnus fasciatus* Burmeister. Cholodkovsky, on the other hand, held that the species which he had named *Lachnus farinosus* was not the same species as that which Kaltenbach had identified with *Lachnus fasciatus* Burmeister. Cholodkovsky then proceeded as follows :—" Wenn also alle auf Nadelhölzern lebenden und mit dunkel gezeichneten Vorderflügeln versehenen *Lachnus*-Arten identisch sein sollen, so müssen sie alle *Lachnus costatus* Zett. heissen."

17. Börner (1930, *Arch. klassif. phylogenet. Ent.* **1** (2) : 125) did not select a type species for the genus *Lachnus* ; he identified *Lachnus fasciatus* Burmeister with *Aphis roboris* Linnaeus and recognised that species as the type species of the genus.

18. In my paper on this subject published in 1930 (*Proc. biol. Soc. Wash.* **43** : 185-188) I followed the same course, identifying *Lachnus fasciatus* Burmeister with *Aphis roboris* Linnaeus and accepting that species as the type species of the genus *Lachnus* Burmeister.

19. Oestlund (1942. *Syst. Aphididae* (1) : 15-16) has also discussed this question. He followed Westwood in treating the generic name *Cinara* Curtis as a synonym of *Lachnus* Burmeister. His views on the type species of *Lachnus* are given in the following passage : " The genus *Cinara*, published during the last month of the same year as *Lachnus*, has been shown to be a synonym of *Lachnus*, but this does not invalidate Curtis setting *Aphis pini* as type and the setting of the type to *Cinara* does not invalidate its application to *Lachnus* as having priority." The " *Aphis pini* " which Oestlund had in mind is the species *Aphis pini* of Linnaeus, as interpreted by Goeze (1778), as is clearly indicated on the previous page of his paper.

20. We have now completed our review of the literature relating to the type species of the genus *Lachnus* Burmeister. Before discussing the action which it is desirable that the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should take in this matter, it will be convenient to consider the associated problem relating to the generic name *Cinara* Curtis, 1835.

(b) The generic name " Cinara " Curtis, 1835

21. Curtis published his description of the genus *Cinara* in Section 576 of Volume 12 of his *British Entomology*. The pages in this Section are not numbered. The date of publication of this Section was December 1835 and the plate accompanying it is dated 1st December. Curtis described and figured *Aphis roboris* Linnaeus as belonging to his genus *Cinara*. In addition, he designated a type species for this genus. Unfortunately, however, in making this designation, Curtis cited his type species as follows : " *Aphis pini* Linn. ?"

22. The fact that Curtis figured and described *Aphis roboris* Linnaeus as belonging to the genus *Cinara* has led some specialists to consider that species to be the actual type species of *Cinara*. Theobald (1929, *Plant Lice Gt. Brit.* **3** : 352), for example, expressed the following view, quoting from Laing : " The point is simply this, Curtis defines the genus *Cinara* and describes and figures *roboris*. Unfortunately, he says : 'Typical species : *Aphis pini* ? Linnaeus '. It was obvious, therefore, he knew nothing about *pini* and that he had in mind for his genotype what he was figuring and describing, namely *roboris*. It is my contention that you cannot base genera on species you do not know and that in nomenclature you must interpret what a man obviously meant." It is not possible, however, to sustain the argument that Curtis did not have a clear idea of what *Aphis pini* Linnaeus was, for on the page following that on which the generic name *Cinara* first appeared he wrote : " Nos. 20 to 30 enumerated in the Guide with the exception of No. 29 belong to this genus." Reference to the Guide shows that *Aphis pini* Linnaeus was No. 22. It is perfectly clear, therefore, that Curtis considered the species *Aphis pini* Linnaeus (whatever he may have thought that species to be), belonged to his new genus *Cinara*. Thus, the nominal species *Aphis pini* Linnaeus is unquestionably the type species by original designation, if a satisfactory explanation can be found for the use by Curtis of a question mark, when he designated that species as the type species. Oestlund in 1942 (: 15-16) offered the following explanation of Curtis' action : " The mark is not an expression of doubt that *Aphis pini* is the type, but refers to the fact that *Aphis pini* is a composite that includes the two species found in Sweden that were named *Aphis nudi pini* and *tomentosa pini* by De Geer. 1773. Curtis questions which of these two should be the type according to the binomial method, recognising that De Geer persisted in following the vernacular method of naming species." One has to admit however that in a matter of this kind one guess is almost as good as another as to what Curtis meant by the question mark which he placed after the name of Linnaeus. In any case, Curtis' action in this matter must be considered as a flaw in his designation of *Aphis pini* Linnaeus to be the type species of *Cinara* Curtis. and action is needed to remove this defect.

23. In 1840 (*Introd. Class Ins.* **2** (Syn.) : 118) Westwood, who may be expected to have been familiar with the respective dates of publication of the works in which Burmeister and Curtis published the generic names discussed above, placed the name *Cinara* Curtis as a synonym of the name *Lachnus* Burmeister. In doing so. he probably acted on the basis of his knowledge of the priority of the name *Lachnus.* This action by Westwood has also contributed to the confusion which has occurred in regard to these two generic names. I can find no exact date for the appearance of Volume 2 of Burmeister's *Handbuch der Entomologis*, other than given on the title page, where the date is given as 1835. and a reference in the *Annales de la Societe entomologique de France* (**4** : cxiv), published in 1835, where it appears that the foregoing volume of Burmeister's *Handbuch* was published on some date between October 1st and December 31st, 1835. Burmeister himself (1836, *Archiv. für Naturgeschichte* **2** : 325) cited his *Handbuch* as having appeared in 1835.

24. Thus, on the meagre data available, it is possible that the name *Lachnus* Burmeister was published a few weeks before the name *Cinara* Curtis, for the Part containing the name *Cinara* is dated 1st December 1835. whereas, although it is possible that the name *Lachnus* was not published until the end of December 1835 (i.e. some four weeks after the publication of the name *Cinara*), it is possible also that it may have been published in 1835 as early as the beginning of October, i.e. two months before the publication of the name *Cinara.* As already observed (paragraph 22) it would be reasonable to expect that such an authority as Westwood, writing (in 1840) only five years after the publication of these names, would know which of the two names was the first to have been published, and the fact that he sank the name *Cinara* Curtis as a synonym of the name *Lachnus* Burmeister lends color to the view that the name *Lachnus* was published before the name *Cinara.* Up to 1948 the International Rules contained no provisions for determining the relative dates to be assigned, for the purposes of the Law of Priority, to names in cases where there was no definite evidence to show which of any given pair was the first to be published. In 1948 this defect in the Rules was remedied by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology when it was decided to incorporate in the *Règles* a series of provisions dealing with this subject, the general principle adopted being that in such a case each of the names concerned is to rank for the purposes of priority as from the earliest date as from which it is known with certainty to have been published, i.e. where a name is known to have been published between say 1st January and 15th February of a given year, it is to rank for the purposes of priority as from 15th February of the year in question, that being the earliest date as from which it is definitely known to have been published (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 223-225). Applying these rules to the case here under consideration, we find (1) that 31st December 1835 is the earliest date by which it is known with certainty that the name *Lachnus* Burmeister was published and (2) that the name *Cinara* Curtis is to be treated as having been published on 1st December 1835, that date having been affixed to the portion of Curtis' book in which this name first appeared. We see therefore that under the *Règles* the name *Cinara* Curtis has several weeks priority over the name *Lachnus* Burmeister.

25. In 1910 (*Ent. News* **21** : 149) Wilson selected what he called "*pini* Curtis" to be the type species of *Cinara* Curtis. This action was invalid, for, quite apart from the fact that Curtis had (though defectively) designated *Aphis pini* Linnaeus as the type species of this genus, Curtis never described a species under the specific name *pini* and there is therefore no such specific name as *pini* Curtis.

26. In 1911 (*Ann. ent. Soc. Amer.* **4** : 52-53) Wilson again discussed this subject, though without making any reference to his action in the previous year in selecting "*pini* Curtis" as the type species of this genus. He now rejected Curtis' selection of *Aphis pini* Linnaeus on account of the use by Curtis of a question mark, when so doing. Wilson thereupon suggested that *Aphis roboris* Linnaeus might be the species which should be regarded as being the type species, since this was the one species which Curtis described in full. In a footnote Wilson went on to make the following observation: "The question of the validity of this genus rests upon the fact that Curtis did not give *roboris* as the type and the other species is questioned. The author then concludes that the genus is in question and cannot be placed as a valid genus."

27. Baker, in 1920 (*U.S. Dept. Agric. Bull.* **826** : 15-18), without giving any discussion, gave the generic name *Cinara* Curtis (which he misspelt *Cinaria* and to which he attributed the erroneous date "1853") as a questionable synonym of *Eulachnus* del Guercio, 1911. In the same paper, when discussing the genus *Pterochlorus* Rondani, Baker rejected *Aphis roboris* Linnaeus as the type species of *Cinara* Curtis, following Wilson (1911) in believing that Curtis placed only two species in that genus when he first published its name, overlooking the reference by Curtis to the species enumerated in the "Guide." In this paper Baker recognised his nominal genus *Dilachnus* Baker, 1919 (*Canad. Ent.* **51** : 253) as a good genus and characterised it as having the media of the forewings twice-branched. Thus, he took care of the two species which he had excluded from the genus *Lachnus* when he selected as the type species of that genus a species in which the media were only once-branched.

28. Börner in 1930 (*Arch. Klassif. phylogenet. Ent.* **1** (2) : 125) recognised *Aphis pini* Linnaeus as the type species of *Cinara* Curtis. I adopted the same course in my paper published in the same year (Hottes, 1930, *Proc. biol. Soc. Wash.* **43** : 185-186). While a student of Oestlund's, I was assigned by him the task of studying the synonymy of the generic names *Lachnus* and *Cinara* and the question of the type species of those genera. Oestlund could never bring himself to recognise the generic name *Cinara*, because he wished to retain the name *Lachnus* for species congeneric with *Aphis pini* Linnaeus, as witnessed by his last contribution, published in 1942 (: 15-16), in which he treated the name *Cinara* as a synonym of *Lachnus*.

(c) Conclusions

29. Having now brought to a close the story of the generic names *Lachnus* and *Cinara*, I turn to the question of the action which it is desired that the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should take in the present case. As the application now submitted will have shown, the generic names *Lachnus* Burmeister 1835, and *Cinara* Curtis, 1835, are both very well-known names, but unfortunately the current use of the first of these names is entirely at variance with the provisions of the *Règles*, while, without a ruling from the International Commission, it is impossible to determine with certainty what species should, under the *Règles*, be regarded as the type species of the second of the nominal genera in question.

30. In the case of *Lachnus* Burmeister, the type species, under the *Règles*, is undoubtedly *Lachnus punctatus* Burmeister, 1835, that having been the first of the nominal species cited under the generic name *Lachnus* on the occasion when that name was first published to have been selected (by Wilson, 1910) as the type species of this genus. The nominal species *Lachnus punctatus* Burmeister, 1835, is now subjectively identified with *Aphis seligna* Gmelin, 1789. On the other hand, the universally accepted type species for this genus is *Aphis roboris* Linnaeus, 1758, a nominal species not placed by Burmeister in the genus *Lachnus*, in which however he did include the nominal species *Lachnus fasciatus* Burmeister, 1835, which is now generally regarded as being subjectively identical with *Aphis roboris* Linnaeus. The substitution of *Lachnus punctatus* Burmeister for *Aphis roboris* Linnaeus as the type species of this genus would lead to great confusion, and is a change which it is essential should be prevented from occurring.

31. The generic name *Cinara* Curtis, 1835, has been widely used for the species identified as *Aphis pini* Linnaeus, 1758, and its allies, but, as already explained, the use by Curtis of a question mark, when designating that species as the type species of this genus has led some workers to reject that type designation. Workers who have taken this view have regarded *Aphis roboris* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of *Cinara*, and, as those workers have also regarded that species as the type species *Lachnus* Burmeister, 1835, their action has had the effect of rendering (in their view) the nominal genera *Lachnus* and *Cinara* as objectively identical with one another and thus of making the names *Lachnus* Burmeister, 1835, and *Cinara* Curtis, 1835, objective synonyms of one another. Owing to the fact that these names were published at very nearly the same time, different views have been taken by workers as to which of these names should be treated as having priority over the other, there being until 1948 no provisions in the International Rules for determining the relative priority to be assigned in such circumstances to the names comprised in any given pair of names. Under the provisions inserted in the *Règles* by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology in 1948 it is now seen (paragraph 24 above) that the name *Cinara* Curtis possesses priority over the name *Lachnus* Burmeister.

32. The greatest confusion would ensue if the names *Cinara* Curtis and *Lachnus* Burmeister were to become synonyms of one another and it is one of the principal purposes of the present application to secure a settlement which will eliminate this risk. The basis of the settlement now asked for is the acceptance, under the Plenary Powers, (1) of *Aphis roboris* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of *Lachnus* Burmeister, 1835, and (2) of *Aphis pini* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of *Cinara* Curtis, 1835, for it is believed that it is only by this action that the long-standing discussion of this subject can be brought to a satisfactory close. It is certain that, if no action were to be taken under the Plenary Powers and the *Règles* were to be strictly applied, the most serious confusion would be inevitable. In connection with the foregoing proposal, there is, it must be noted, a technical defect in the trivial name *pini* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Aphis pini*) which will need to be remedied before the foregoing request can be granted. A recommendation on this subject is submitted to the International Commission in the immediately preceding application (Z.N.(S.)547).

33. The specific proposals which are submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature are that the Commission should :

(1) use its Plenary Powers :—

(*a*) to set aside all designations or selections of type species for the genera *Lachnus* Burmeister, 1835, and *Cinara* Curtis, 1835, made prior to the decision now proposed to be taken ;

(*b*) to designate the under-mentioned species to be the type species of the genera referred to in (*a*) above :—

Name of genus (1)	*Species recommended to be designated as the type species of the genera specified in Col.* (1) (2)
(i) *Lachnus* Burmeister, 1835	*Aphis roboris* Linnaeus, 1758
(ii) *Cinara* Curtis, 1835	*Aphis pini* Linnaeus, 1758 (defined, as recommended in application Z.N.(S.)547)

(2) place the generic names *Lachnus* Burmeister, 1835, and *Cinara* Curtis, 1835, with the type species severally specified in (1) (*b*) above, on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* :

(3) place the specific name *roboris* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Aphis roboris*) on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* :

(4) place the name *Cinaria* Baker, 1920 (an Invalid Subsequent Spelling of *Cinara* Curtis, 1835), on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology*.

REPORT ON THE APPLICATION SUBMITTED TO THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE IN RELATION TO THE GENERIC NAMES "LACHNUS" BURMEISTER, 1835, AND "CINARA" CURTIS, 1835 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER HEMIPTERA)

By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.
(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)174)

The purpose of the present Report is to lay before the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature particulars of the comments so far received in regard to the application now before it in regard to the generic names *Lachnus* Burmeister, 1835, and *Cinara* Curtis, 1835 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera).

2. This question was first raised informally in a letter dated 24th February 1930 addressed by Professor F. C. Hottes (then of the James Millikin University, Decatur, Illinois, U.S.A.) to the late Dr. C. W. Stiles, my predecessor in the Office of Secretary to the International Commission. In this letter Professor Hottes drew attention to the difficulties arising from the fact that the first valid type selection for *Lachnus* Burmeister, 1835, was that by Wilson (1910) who had then selected *Lachnus punctatus* Burmeister, 1835, whereas the species commonly accepted as the type species of this genus was *Lachnus fasciatus* Burmeister, 1835, selected a year later (1911), also by Wilson. At the same time Professor Hottes drew attention to the difficulties which existed also in determining the type species of the genus *Cinara* Curtis, 1835, in view of the fact that, when Curtis designated "*pini* Linnaeus" as the type species of this genus, he added a question mark after the word "Linnaeus", thereby throwing into doubt the action which he conceived himself to be taking. The correspondence, which then ensued, did not lead to the submission of an application to the Commission.

3. Among the papers transferred to my charge on my becoming Secretary to the International Commission, I found references to a possible application to the International Commission on this subject but the actual documents handed over to me did not include any of the earlier correspondence relating to this case. When in 1944 I was able to turn my attention to this case, I wrote to Professor Hottes, referring to the correspondence which he had had on this subject with Dr. Stiles and asking whether he proposed to submit an application to the International Commission. At the same time I wrote to Dr. S. A. Rohwer (Assistant Chief, Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.), to whom it appeared (from other papers which had been transferred to me) that perhaps the earlier correspondence had been sent by Dr. Stiles; I asked that, if this was so, these papers should be returned for incorporation in the records of the International Commission.

4. In October 1944 I received a letter from Professor Hottes, with which he enclosed a copy of a paper entitled "The name *Cinara* versus the name *Lachnus*", which he had written shortly after the correspondence with Dr. Stiles referred to in paragraph 2 above and which had been published in November 1930 (*Proc. biol. Soc. Wash.* **43** : 185–188). In that paper Professor Hottes had set out the grounds which, as he then believed, justified the conclusion that Westwood (1840) had effectively selected *Aphis roboris* Linnaeus, 1758, to be the type species of the genus *Lachnus* Burmeister, 1835, and that Curtis (1835) had validly designated *Aphis pini* Linnaeus, 1758, to be the type species of the genus *Cinara* Curtis, 1835. Professor Hottes went on to say that he recognised that in a matter of this kind the opinion of an individual specialist possessed no official status ; he suggested, therefore, that the International Commission should review the findings which he had reached and, having done so, should render an *Opinion* on the questions at issue. Professor Hottes added that he would be happy to present to the Commission a bibliography of the literature involved and to submit recommendations for the consideration of the Commission.

5. In December 1944 I received a letter from Dr. Rohwer enclosing the earlier correspondence relating to this case (which, as I had anticipated, had been filed in the records of the U.S. Department of Agriculture), together with a memorandum, dated 20th November 1944, on two cases, of which the present was one, which had been prepared by Dr. C. F. W. Muesebeck, Officer in Charge, Division of Insect Identification, Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, U.S. Department of Agriculture. The following is the text of the portion of that memorandum which relates to the present case :

> The case involving *Lachnus* and *Cinara* is not so easily settled. Following the exchange of correspondence between Hottes and Stiles, which is included among the papers I am returning, Hottes (*Proceedings Biological Society of Washington*, Vol. **43**, p. 185, 1930) published a statement which indicated that he considered the question to have been entirely cleared up. The significant passage in his note reads as follows : "Schumacher (1921) clearly established the fact that *Aphis roboris* Linné was the correct type of the genus *Lachnus* by quoting from the second edition of Burmeister's *Handbuch der Entomologie*, page 1006, wherein Burmeister states that his *Lachnus fasciatus* is a synonym of *Aphis roboris* Linné, the type set for *Lachnus* by Westwood in 1840." Unfortunately, he overlooked the requirement that for *roboris* to be eligible for type designation, it must have been included among the species originally cited by Burmeister when he proposed the generic name *Lachnus*. The fact that Burmeister himself later suppressed his *fasciatus*, an originally included species, as a synonym of *roboris*, does not alter the case, and Westwood's 1840 designation is invalid. The first valid type designation seems to be that by Wilson, 1910, who cited *punctatus* Burmeister, a species which was unrecognisable at that time but which has subsequently been made a synonym of *saligna* Gmelin, the type of *Tuberolachnus* Mordvilko, 1908. This generic name has been considered by most recent authors as a synonym of *Pterochlorus* Rondani, 1848, the type of which is *Aphis roboris*. If the zoological conclusions involving the specific names here are correct, *Pterochlorus* and *Tuberolachnus* are synonyms of *Lachnus*.
>
> *Cinara* Curtis, 1835, was proposed with two included species, *Aphis pini* Linnaeus ? and *Aphis roboris*. Curtis himself definitely stated that "*pini* ?" was the type of his genus. It has been contended, however, that he did not know *pini* and that his description and illustrations applied to *roboris*. This is apparently correct. Theobald (*Aphididae of Great Britain*, Vol. 3, p. 352, 1929) quotes Laing on this point, whose concluding statement is : "It is my contention

that you cannot base genera on species you do not know and that in nomenclature you must interpret what a man obviously meant," and he supports Laing's view. Accordingly, we have once more a troublesome problem resulting from the misidentification of a genotype. If the view held by Theobald and Laing is sustained by the Commission, the names *Lachnus* and *Cinara* are synonymous, but there still seems to be uncertainty as to which has priority, both having been published in 1835. If the Commission should agree with Theobald and Laing and then should find that *Lachnus* is the earlier name, some confusion would result from the necessity of treating, under *Lachnus*, the considerable number of Aphids now referred to the genus *Cinara*. It appears that greater stability would follow from the strict application of the Rules and the recognition of *pini* Linnaeus as type of *Cinara*.

6. At the time when the foregoing correspondence took place the world war was still in progress and it was impossible for the International Commission, either then or for some years thereafter, to take decisions on individual nomenclatorial cases. By 1947, however, the situation had sufficiently improved to make it possible to make a start in this direction and in November of that year advertisements in the prescribed form were issued in respect of a number of applications then awaiting attention, each of which involved a possible use by the Commission of its Plenary Powers. Among the applications so advertised was that relating to the generic names *Lachnus* and *Cinara*, the advertisement issued making it clear that the application received involved the possible use by the Commission of its Plenary Powers to designate (1) *Aphis roboris* Linnaeus, 1758, to be the type species of *Lachnus* Burmeister, 1835, and (2) *Aphis pini* Linnaeus, 1758, to be the type species of *Cinara* Curtis, 1835.

7. The foregoing advertisement elicited comments from two quarters :—

(1) **Professor Miriam A. Palmer** (*Colorado A. & M. College, Entomology Department, Fort Colorado, Colorado, U.S.A.*) stated (in a letter dated 13th January 1948):—"I am in full accord with both proposals under this file number."

(2) **Mr. F. H. Jacob, M.Sc.** (*Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, National Agricultural Advisory Service, Welsh Sub-Centre, Bangor, United Kingdom*) reported (in a letter dated 10th November 1948) that, after the publication of the foregoing advertisement in *Nature*, he had had correspondence on this subject with Dr. Hille Ris Lambers, who had expressed the opinion (1) that the type species of *Lachnus* Burmeister was *Lachnus fasciatus* Burmeister (=*Aphis roboris* Linnaeus), by selection by Westwood (1840) and therefore that there was no need for the Plenary Powers to be used to secure this end ; (2) that " *Cinara* Curtis 1835 type ' *pini* L. ? ' is all right " and that he could not therefore understand why it should be considered that a suspension of the Rules was necessary in this case. As regards the application advertised in *Nature*, Mr. Jacob said : " From the point of view of one interested in Aphids, I consider that it is highly desirable that this proposal should be carried out." Mr. Jacob added : " From the point of view of an economic entomologist it is always a good thing to have these nomenclatorial problems straightened out and fixed once and for all, because it helps to avoid needless confusion of the literature."

8. In 1948 Professor Hottes decided to recast somewhat his application in regard to this case and to resubmit it, together with an application asking the International Commission to issue directions as to the manner in which the nominal species *Aphis pini* Linnaeus, 1758, should be interpreted. This latter question, though in itself entirely distinct from that which forms the subject of Professor Hottes' earlier application, is nevertheless closely bound up with it, owing to the designation (or attempted designation) of the above species by Curtis as the type species of the genus *Cinara* Curtis, 1835. The application in regard to the interpretation of the nominal species *Aphis pini* Linnaeus was received in November 1948. It has been assigned the Registered Number Z.N.(S.)547 (see pp. 166–173 of the present volume).

9. In the period 1948–1950 it was not possible for the International Commission to make any progress with the consideration of applications submitted to it for decision, partly because the Secretariat was fully engaged in the preparation and publication of the volumes of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* (Volumes 3, 4 and 5) containing the *Official Records* of the discussions held by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and by the International Congress of Zoology at their meetings held concurrently in Paris in July 1948, and partly because in one way or another the decisions (procedural and other) taken by the former body necessarily affected every application then awaiting consideration by the Commission. The *Official Records of Proceedings* in Paris were published in 1950, and, as soon as possible thereafter, Professor Hottes made such consequential changes in, and additions to, his two applications as were then seen to be required. These applications, so revised, are accordingly now submitted to the Commission for concurrent consideration.

10. Professor Hottes' application in regard to the names *Lachnus* and *Cinara* has, as its object, only the determination of the species to be accepted as the type species of the nominal genera so named. Incidentally, however, that application raises also a general question of principle in regard to the interpretation of Rule (*a*) in Article 30 in the *Règles*. In accordance with the decision by the Thirteenth International Congress that, in future, decisions on such matters are not to be given in *Opinions* relating to individual names (in the present case, the names *Lachnus* and *Cinara*) but are to be recorded separately in the Series entitled " Declarations " (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 132–137), the question of principle referred to above has been treated as constituting a separate problem and has been allotted the Registered Number Z.N.(S.)715.* A note examining the problem involved and putting forward a suggestion for dealing with it is submitted simultaneously with the present Report for consideration by the International Commission.

---

* See pp. 188 to 190 in the present volume.

PROPOSED ADOPTION OF A "DECLARATION" ON THE QUESTION WHETHER THE INSERTION OF A MARK OF INTERROGATION INVALIDATES A DESIGNATION OF A TYPE SPECIES FOR A GENUS MADE UNDER RULE (a) IN ARTICLE 30 OF THE "RÈGLES"

By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.
(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)715)

The application (File Z.N.(S.)174) submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in regard to the generic name *Cinara* Curtis, 1835 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera), submitted by Professor F. C. Hottes, raises a small question of principle relating to the interpretation of Rule (*a*) in Article 30 of the *Règles*, which, in order to prevent the occurrence of similar problems, it would be convenient if the International Commission were to settle by the issue of a *Declaration*.

2. In the particular case in question Curtis established a new nominal genus to which he gave the name *Cinara* and of which he said that the type species was "*pini* Linnaeus ? "

3. For over half a century the meaning of the action so taken by Curtis has been the subject of discussion among Aphid taxonomists. Some have argued that the insertion by Curtis of a mark of interrogation after the word "Linnaeus" was intended to denote that Curtis only doubtfully designated *Aphis pini* Linnaeus as the type species of this genus; others have held this indicated that Curtis was not personally acquainted with the Linnean species, which was, therefore, from his point of view, a *species inquirenda*. One author put forward the explanation that the insertion of this question mark was designed by Curtis to show that, in his view, the original *Aphis pini* of Linnaeus was a composite species and that, while he certainly intended that the type species of *Cinara* should be the species named *Aphis pini* by Linnaeus, whatever that species might turn out to be, he was not certain to which of two species confused together by Linnaeus the name *Aphis pini* was properly applicable.

4. As was inevitable, these discussions led to no finality and it was for the purpose of putting a term to these fruitless arguments that this case was submitted to the Commission for settlement. For purposes unconnected with the issue immediately under consideration, Professor Hottes has asked the International Commission to use its Plenary Powers to settle the question of the type species of the genus *Cinara* Curtis: he has not therefore asked, as he might have done, for a ruling from the Commission on the question whether the qualification added by Curtis, through the insertion of a question mark in the manner indicated above, invalidated the designation which he then made of a type species for that genus. It is for the purpose of obtaining a ruling on this general question that the present supplementary application is submitted to the International Commission.

5. In the present case we are concerned with a type designation made under Rule (*a*) in Article 30 and not with a type selection made under Rule (*g*) in the same Article. Nevertheless, it will be instructive to pause for a moment to examine what are the requirements laid down by Rule (*g*) and to compare those requirements with those prescribed in Rule (*a*). Rule (*g*) which provides a method of determining the type species of a genus, where the type species has not been determined by any of the preceding Rules (*a*) to (*d*) or Rule (*f*) by the selection of a type species by a later author. Attached to this Rule there is a supplementary provision that the expression " select a type species " is to be " rigidly construed." If therefore, in the present case, Curtis had been a later author selecting a type species of a previously established genus (instead of an original author designating a type species for a genus then being established by himself for the first time), there is no doubt that the insertion by him of a question mark, such as that which he inserted when designating the type species of his own genus *Cinara* would have invalidated the selection so made. For it would clearly be impossible to sustain an argument that on a " rigid " construction of the expression " select a type species " he had unequivocally selected *Aphis pini* Linnaeus to be the type species of the genus *Cinara* Curtis. When, however, we turn to the Rule (Rule (*a*)) governing the designation of the type species of a genus by the original author of that genus at the time when the generic name in question is first published, we find that there is no supplementary provision analogous to that contained in Rule (*g*), prescribing that the expression " designate a type species " is to be " rigidly construed."

6. The foregoing difference between Rule (*g*) and Rule (*a*) is due mainly to the fact that the supplementary provision now incorporated in Rule (*g*) did not form part of the original draft of the present Article 30 (which was substituted for the earlier text of this Article by the Seventh International Congress of Zoology at Boston in 1907) but was added at a later stage during the discussion of that draft in order to meet a point raised by the late Commissioner David Starr Jordan of Stanford University that it was essential that this Rule should be so drafted as to exclude from acceptance as type selections the numerous cases where authors had cited under a given previously published generic name a single species, either because that species alone was relevant to the purposes of the book or paper concerned (e.g. where a single species was so cited in a book or paper dealing only with a limited faunistic area) or because the author concerned wished to cite an example of the genus in question without reference to the purely nomenclatorial question of the species to be regarded as the type species of that genus. There is no evidence at all to suggest that, when this addition was made to Rule (*g*), any consideration was given to the question whether a corresponding addition should be made to Rule (*a*). Most probably no consideration was given to this question, for, whereas risk of doubtful cases arising under Rule (*g*), and consequently the need for special safeguards in that Rule was very great, the risk of similar cases arising under Rule (*a*) was very remote, for in the nature of the case the author of a new genus who wishes himself to designate a type species for that genus will almost invariably do so in a clear and unambiguous manner, cases where an author designates the type species of a genus established by himself in an obscure or qualified manner necessarily being extremely rare.

7. There is certainly nothing in Article 30 to suggest that a lower standard of precision is permissible under Rule (*a*) than that which is required under Rule (*g*). Accordingly, it may fairly be concluded even without any further clarification that Rule (*a*) should exclude from validity an original type designation made in an ambiguous or qualified manner, just as Rule (*g*) clearly excludes from validity a subsequent type selection made in such a manner.

8. Nevertheless, the fact, as we have seen, that discussion on this subject has been proceeding among specialists for over fifty years in the case of the generic name *Cinara* Curtis points strongly to the conclusion that, in order to avoid further waste of time of this sort, it is desirable that an express ruling should be given by the International Commission on this subject.

9. It is accordingly suggested, for the consideration of the International Commission, that it would be helpful if a *Declaration* were now to be rendered containing a ruling to the following effect: "For the purposes of Rule (*a*) in Article 30, the expression 'designate a type species' is to be rigidly construed and is not to be held cover a designation made in an ambiguous or qualified manner."

[illegible]
PURCHASED

CONTENTS OF THE PRESENT PART

(continued from front wrapper)

Page

Proposed use of the Plenary Powers to suppress the specific name *brouni* Hutton, 1901, as published in the combination *Drosophila brouni*, for the purpose of preserving the specific name *immigrans* Sturtevant, 1921, as published in the combination *Drosophila immigrans* (Class Insecta, Order Diptera). By Ernst Mayr (*Cambridge, Mass.*), J. T. Patterson (*Austin, Texas*), Marshall P. Wheeler (*Austin, Texas*), Warren P. Spencer (*College of Wooster, Ohio*) 161

Proposed use of the Plenary Powers to validate the specific name *pruni* Geoffroy, 1762, as published in the combination *Aphis pruni* (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera). By F. C. Hottes (*Grand Junction, Colorado, U.S.A.*) 163

Proposed addition to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* of the specific name *pini* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Aphis pini* and as interpreted by De Geer (1773) (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera). By F. C. Hottes (*Grand Junction, Colorado, U.S.A.*) 166

Proposed use of the Plenary Powers to designate, as the type species of *Lachnus* Burmeister, 1835, and *Cinara* Curtis, 1835 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera) a species in harmony with accepted nomenclatorial practice. By F. C. Hottes (*Grand Junction, Colorado, U.S.A.*) 174

Report on the application submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in relation to the generic names *Lachnus* Burmeister, 1835, and *Cinara* Curtis, 1835 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera). By Francis Hemming, *Secretary to the International Commission* 184

Proposed adoption of a *Declaration* on the question whether the insertion of a mark of interrogation invalidates a designation of a type species for a genus made under Rule (a) in Article 30 of the *Règles*. By Francis Hemming, *Secretary to the International Commission* .. 188

IMPORTANT NOTICE

All applications to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should be addressed to Francis Hemming, Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, 28 Park Village East, London, N.W.1, England.

Zoologists are particularly requested to assist the work of the Commission by complying with the following requirements: (1) Applications should be submitted in duplicate; (2) applications should be typed, double-spaced, on one side of the paper only and with wide margins.

Printed in Great Britain by Metchim and Son Ltd., Westminster, London

VOLUME 9. Part 7
pp. 191-222

11*th May* 1954

PURCHASED

THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

The Official Organ of

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Edited by

FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

CONTENTS :

Notices prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology : Page

Date of commencement by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of voting on applications published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* 191

Notice of the possible use by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of its Plenary Powers in certain cases 192

(*continued on back wrapper*)

LONDON:

Printed by Order of the International Trust for
Zoological Nomenclature
and
Sold on behalf of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
by the International Trust
at its Publications Office,
41 Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.
1954

Price Twelve Shillings and Sixpence

(*All rights reserved*)

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

A. The Officers of the Commission

Honorary Life President : Dr. Karl Jordan (*British Museum* (*Natural History*), *Zoological Museum, Tring, Herts., England*)

President : Professor James Chester Bradley (*Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*) (12th August 1953)

Vice-President : Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (*Sao Paulo, Brazil*) (12th August 1953)

Secretary : Mr. Francis Hemming (*London, England*) (27th July 1948)

B. The Members of the Commission

(*Arranged in order of precedence by reference to date of election or of most recent re-election, as prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology*)

Professor H. Boschma (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The Netherlands*) (1st January 1947)
Senor Dr. Angel Cabrera (*Eva Peron, F.C.N.G.R., Argentina*) (27th July 1948)
Mr. Francis Hemming (*London, England*) (27th July 1948) (*Secretary*)
Dr. Joseph Pearson (*Tasmanian Museum, Hobart, Tasmania, Australia*) (27th July 1948)
Dr. Henning Lemche (*Universitetets Zoologiske Museum, Copenhagen, Denmark*) (27th July 1948)
Professor Teiso Esaki (*Kyushu University, Fukuoka, Japan*) (17th April 1950)
Professor Pierre Bonnet (*Université de Toulouse, France*) (9th June 1950)
Mr. Norman Denbigh Riley (*British Museum* (*Natural History*) *London*) (9th June 1950)
Professor Tadeusz Jaczewski (*Institute of Zoology, Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw, Poland*) (15th June 1950)
Professor Robert Mertens (*Natur-Museum u. Forschungs-Institut Senckenberg, Frankfurt a. M., Germany*) (5th July 1950)
Professor Erich Martin Hering (*Zoologisches Museum der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Germany*) (5th July 1950)
Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (*S. Paulo, Brazil*) (12th August 1953) (*Vice-President*)
Professor J. R. Dymond (*University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada*) (12th August 1953)
Professor J. Chester Bradley (*Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*) (12th August 1953) (*President*)
Professor Harold E. Vokes (*Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, U.S.A.*) (12th August 1953)
Professor Béla Hankó (*Békéscsaba, Hungary*) (12th August 1953)
Dr. Norman R. Stoll (*Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, New York, N.Y., U.S.A.*) (12th August 1953)
Mr. P. C. Sylvester-Bradley (*Sheffield University, Sheffield, England*) (12th August 1953)
Dr. L. B. Holthuis (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The Netherlands*) (12th August 1953)

BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Volume 9, Part 7 (pp. 191–222) 11th May 1954

NOTICES PRESCRIBED BY THE INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ZOOLOGY

The following notices are given in pursuance of decisions taken, on the recommendation of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 51–56, 57–59), by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, July 1948 (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **5** : 5–13, 131).

(a) Date of commencement by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of voting on applications published in the "Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature"

Notice is hereby given that normally the International Commission may start to vote upon applications published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* on the expiry of a period of six calendar months from the date of publication in the *Bulletin* of the applications in question. Any specialist who may desire to comment upon any of the applications published in the present Part (vol. 9, Part 7) of the *Bulletin* is accordingly invited to do so in writing to the Secretary to the Commission, as quickly as possible and in any case, in sufficient time to enable the communication in question to reach the Secretariat of the Commission before the expiry of the six-month period referred to above.

Notices prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology (*continued*)

(b) Notice of the possible use by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of its Plenary Powers in certain cases

1. NOTICE is hereby given that the possible use by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of its Plenary Powers, is involved in applications published in the present Part of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* in relation to the following names :—

(1) *Stentor Oken*, 1815 (Class Ciliophora) validation of, and designation of a type species in harmony with accustomed usage (Z.N.(S.) 261) ;

(2) *Melanargia* Meigen, 1828 (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera) validation of (Z.N.(S.)708).

2. Comments received in sufficient time will be published in the *Bulletin* : other comments, provided that they are received within the prescribed period of six calendar months from the date of publication of the present Part will be laid before the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at the time of commencement of voting on the application concerned.

3. In accordance with the arrangement agreed upon at the Session held by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in Paris in 1948 (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 56) corresponding Notices have been sent to the serial publications " Nature " and " Science."

FRANCIS HEMMING,
Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

28 Park Village East, Regent's Park,
LONDON, N.W.1, England.

11*th May* 1954.

REPORT ON THE STATUS OF NEW NAMES PUBLISHED IN OKEN, [1815-1816], "LEHRBUCH DER NATURGESCHICHTE"

By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.
Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

(Reference : Official Record of Proceedings of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature. Paris Session, 13th Meeting, Conclusion 13)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)153)

I. Introductory

In pursuance of the request addressed to me by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at the third of their Meetings held during their Paris Session on Monday 26th July 1948 (Paris Session, 13th Meeting, Conclusion 13), I submit herewith for the consideration of the Commission and of interested zoologists generally the following Report on the question of the status of new names published in Oken's *Lehrbuch der Naturgeschichte*, Volume **3** (Zoologie), issued in two *Abtheilungen*, of which the first (" Fleischlose Thiere ", pp. xxviii, 842, xviii, iv, 40 pls.) appeared in 1815 and the second (" Fleischthiere ", xvi, 1270 [2], 1 *tab*, with pp. 843–50 supplementary to *Abth.* 1) in 1816.

2. An authoritative statement on the status of new names in the *Lehrbuch* is long overdue, for there has been great diversity of practice among zoologists in regard to this matter, specialists in some branches (particularly in mammalogy) having in recent decades taken to using some or all of these names, while specialists in other groups have largely ignored this work. The late Dr. Wilfred H. Osgood of Chicago therefore rendered a valuable service when in 1944 he invited the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to give an authoritative ruling on this subject.

3. It was evident from the outset that considerable difficulties must be anticipated, whatever the decision taken by the Commission. If the Commission were to rule that in the *Lehrbuch* Oken had complied with the requirements of the *Règles*, a great deal of work would be involved in many groups in determining the application of the numerous names which would then be seen to possess availability either as generic or subgeneric names and, in view of the early date of the *Lehrbuch*, there was every likelihood that this investigation would show that some, possibly many, of the Oken names were applicable to, and were the oldest names for, genera for which later names were in common use. If, on the other hand, the Commission were to rule that in the *Lehrbuch* Oken had not complied with the requirements of the *Règles*, then also it was evident that well-known genera currently known by Oken names would be found to require new names under the Law of Priority. In either case therefore it was certain that important issues affecting the stability of nomenclature were involved in the status to be accorded to names published in the *Lehrbuch*.

4. At the time when Dr. Osgood submitted his application, it would have been difficult, if not impossible, for the Commission to reach a conclusion on this matter, for a large part of the arguments which had been advanced for and against the acceptance of Oken's names turned on the meaning to be attached to the expression " nomenclature binaire " which then figured in Proviso (*b*) to Article 25. This latter problem, which formerly had been the cause of much controversy, was, at the time of the receipt of Dr. Osgood's application, *sub judice*, the Twelfth International Congress of Zoology at its meeting held at Lisbon in 1935 having decided that it was essential that this matter should be settled once and for all at the next (Thirteenth) International Congress and having, to this end, instructed the Commission to prepare a comprehensive Report on this subject for consideration by the Thirteenth Congress.

5. The question of the meaning of the expression " nomenclature binaire ", the settlement of which was—as already explained—a pre-requisite to the consideration of the status of Oken's *Lehrbuch* names was disposed of by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology in Paris in July 1948. On the unanimous recommendation of the Commission, with the equally unanimous support of the Section on Nomenclature, the Congress, after ruling that the foregoing expression had a meaning identical with that of the expression " nomenclature binominale ", decided to delete from Proviso (*b*) to Article 25 (and also from Article 26) the expression " nomenclature binaire " and to replace it by the expression " nomenclature binominale " (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 63–66). At the same time the Congress recognised that, where under the foregoing clarification of the *Règles*, it became evident that a given book did not satisfy the requirements of Article 25, rapid use by the Commission of its Plenary Powers would be needed to prevent instability from arising in the nomenclature of any group in which names first published in the book concerned were in common use. For this purpose, the Congress decided that in such cases the prescribed period of waiting might be waived by the Commission which should therefore be free at once to act for the purpose of preventing well-known names from being discarded in favour of names hitherto treated as synonyms (*see* Proceedings of the Commission, Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion 13(3)(*a*)(iii), published in 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 65).

6. Later during its Paris meeting the Thirteenth Congress approved also a recommendation that words should be inserted in the *Règles* making clear the meaning of the expression " les principes de la nomenclature binominale ", as used in Proviso (*b*) to Article 25 (as amended earlier during the Congress). As so clarified, Proviso (*b*) to Article 25 provides that, in order to qualify as having applied " les principes de la nomenclature binominale " in any given work, an author must have consistently applied those principles in the book in question and not merely in a particular section or passage (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 175). The purpose, and the effect, of this clarification of Article 25 is to make it clear that, when an author who does not use a binominal system of nomenclature nevertheless here or there in a given work applies to some species a name which, by reason of consisting of two words only, happens to constitute a binominal combination, the name in question is not to be treated as acquiring availability under the *Règles*.

7. The late Dr. Osgood's application regarding the status of names published in Oken's *Lehrbuch* was considered by the Commission at the third of its meetings, held on Monday, 26th July 1948 (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 365-366). In the discussion which then took place stress was laid upon the importance and urgency of the problem submitted by Dr. Osgood. It was then explained that the application had not been published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 365) ; nor has it since been published, as it was considered that it would be more convenient if publication were to be delayed until the present Report was also available. It is now annexed as Appendix I. At the Paris meeting it was felt that a further opportunity for study was desirable, in which to examine the situation anew in the light of the decisions that had just been taken to amend and clarify Proviso (*b*) to Article 25. The situation was complicated both by the diversity of practice among zoologists in different parts of the Animal Kingdom and by the fact that, owing to its rarity, relatively few zoologists had had an opportunity of studying Oken's *Lehrbuch* at first hand. The Commission therefore agreed (*a*) to take into consideration Dr. Osgood's application in regard to Oken's *Lehrbuch* as soon as possible after the close of the Paris Congress, and (*b*), for the purpose of facilitating that consideration, to invite the Secretary to confer with specialists on the question of the practice (whether acceptance or rejection) adopted in their respective groups, and to submit a Report thereon.

II. On the question whether in the "Lehrbuch der Naturgeschichte" Oken consistently applied the principles of binominal nomenclature

8. In the early part of 1944, shortly before the receipt of Dr. Osgood's application in regard to the status of names in Oken's *Lehrbuch*, I had occasion myself to investigate this matter in connection with a proposal submitted to the Commission by the late Dr. C. W. Stiles that the names of genera of the Order Carnivora from species of which had been reported parasites common to Man should, because of their importance from the point of view of Public Health, be added to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*. For among the names which thus became candidates for admission to the *Official List* there were three Oken names (*Genetta* Oken ; *Grison* Oken ; *Tayra* Oken). At that time the principal scientific libraries had been evacuated from London to avoid risk of destruction by air-raids and it was therefore not possible for me personally either to examine the entries in Oken's *Lehrbuch* in regard to the foregoing names or to review the conclusions in regard to the status to be accorded to that work which I had formed when before the outbreak of war I had had occasion to consider this question in the course of my survey of the generic names of the butterflies. There was however, as I knew, a copy of the *Lehrbuch* in the library of the Zoological Museum, Tring, and I accordingly sought the assistance in this matter of Dr. Karl Jordan, at that time the President of the International Commission. Dr. Jordan at once undertook to investigate this matter and in a letter dated 10th June 1944 he very kindly furnished a detailed Report. This

Report is annexed to the present Report as Appendix 2. At the same time I took the view that the general problem of the status of new names published in Oken's *Lehrbuch* (which had been raised by Dr. Osgood) and the particular problem of how to stabilise the names of the three genera of Carnivora from which parasites common to Man had been reported and for which names had been published by Oken in the *Lehrbuch* (which had been raised by the late Dr. Stiles) were of such importance that they should at once be brought to the attention of interested specialists, even though the war conditions then obtaining would inevitably render such a consultation only preliminary in character. I accordingly prepared a short note on this subject, which, however, owing to the long delays in printing inevitable at that time was not actually published until July 1945 (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 112–113).

9. The general character of Oken's *Lehrbuch* is well illustrated by the analysis given by Dr. Jordan of the treatment accorded by Oken to what he called the first genus (1 Gattung) of his fifth tribe (5 Sippschaft). The genus is divided into six groups ; no Latin name is applied to the genus which has for its title only the German word " Muffer." Of the six groups into which the genus is divided four are headed both by a vernacular name and by a Latin noun, one is headed by a vernacular name (Stunk) and by two Latin nouns (*Mephitis* and *Viverra*), while the third group has only a vernacular name (Iltis). When we come to examine the terms applied to species (Arten), we find an equal lack of consistency of treatment. In the first group (*Meles*, Dachs) of the genus, each of the three species recognised is given an apparently binominal name, the first part of which consists of the word *Meles*. When we come to the second group (Stunk, *Mephitis*, *Viverra*), we find that each of the three species recognised is given a vernacular German name only (Zweistreifiger St. ; Fünfstreifiger St. ; Einstreifiger St.). Finally we have to note that each species is in turn subdivided, the appellations given to these subdivisions being of every possible variety, e.g. (*a*) vernacular names such as Teufelskind ; (*b*) a vernacular word followed by a Latin noun (which may be either a generic name or a univerbal Latin specific name in the manner of Gesner and other writers of the pre-1758 age), an example of this kind being provided by the second subdivision of the first species of the second group (Stunk) of the genus " Muffer ", where we find the entry " Yaguare, Zorills, Muffer " ; (*c*) a Latin binominal name such as *Gulo quitensis* (first species, third subdivision) ; and (*d*) a Latin trinominal name such as *Putorius americanus striatus* (second species, first subdivision).

10. The examples cited above show (1) that the system of nomenclature used by Oken in his *Lehrbuch* is utterly lacking in consistency ; (2) that it consists of the random use of Latin words and vernacular German words for the various categories recognised ; (3) that even if the terms applied to the genus (*Gattung*) and species (*Arten*) are disregarded, there is absolutely no consistency in the use of the terms employed to denote the units into which the various species are subdivided, it being apparently pure chance whether (i) a vernacular German word or (ii) such a word cited in combination with a Latin noun or (iii) a binominal combination of the Linnean type or (iv) a trinominal of the pre-1758 kind is used to denote the taxonomic unit in question.

11. In these circumstances I have no hesitation in reporting that in Volume **3** (Zoologie) of the *Lehrbuch der Naturesgeschichte* Oken did not apply " les principes de la nomenclature binominale ". Accordingly, no name appearing in the above volume of the *Lehrbuch* acquired any availability under the *Règles* in virtue of having been so published.

12. I have further to add that, prior to the clarification of Proviso (*b*) to Articles 25 of the *Règles* by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology in Paris in 1948, the question of the availability of the names in Oken's *Lehrbuch* was examined by a number of authorities who rejected the claims advanced in favour of those names by Allen (J. A.) (1902), notwithstanding the fact that, before the Paris Congress, the presence in Proviso (*b*) of the ambiguous expression " nomenclature binaire " offered some scope for the defence of those names, which has disappeared now that that expression has been replaced by the unequivocal expression " nomenclature binominale." These authorities include : (1) Stiles (C. W.) & Orleman, 1927, *Hyg. Lab. Bull.* **145** ; (2) Cabrera (A.), 1943, *Ciencia* **4** (Nos. 4–5) : Hershkowitz (P.), 1949, *J. Mammal.* **30** : 289–301. Of these authorities Dr. Cabrera, who is himself a member of the Commission, has kindly furnished me with a supplementary statement of his views, together with extracts from the salient portions of his paper of 1943. This statement is annexed to the present Report as Appendix 3.

III. On the effects of alternative treatments to be accorded to the names published in Volume 3 (Zoologie) of Oken's " Lehrbuch der Naturgeschichte " on stability in nomenclature

13. The late Dr. Osgood pointed out that a number of names which first appeared in volume **3** (Zoologie) of Oken's *Lehrbuch der Naturgeschichte* had come to be commonly accepted for well-known and important genera, instancing in this connection in the Class Mammalia the names *Citellus* Oken (for the very large group of ground squirrels of Asia and America), *Panthera* Oken (as a subgeneric name for the large cats, including the lion, the tiger, the leopard and others) and *Thos* Oken for the jackals. Dr. Osgood himself (as he made clear in his letter to me of 13th September 1944, an extract from which is appended to his application) was strongly opposed to the acceptance of Oken's names, but his references to the generic names cited above, coupled with the concluding remarks in his application, where he referred to the Commission's Plenary Powers, suggests that he had in mind that the Commission, when rejecting Oken's *Lehrbuch*, should make use of its Plenary Powers to preserve those of Oken's names which had taken deep root in the literature of mammalogy.

14. If such were in fact the ideas which Dr. Osgood had in mind, he only anticipated by a few years the view widely held and strongly expressed both within the Commission and in the general body of the Section on Nomenclature of the Paris and Copenhagen Congresses that means should be found for preventing decisions on purely technical nomenclatorial matters from having the effect of upsetting well-established names. It was indeed because the Paris Congress recognised that the declaration against the availability of non-binominal works that had hitherto been accepted (in whole or in part) on the ground that the nomenclature used therein, though not " binominal " was " binary " and therefore acceptable under the *Règles* might in some cases lead to the upsetting of well-known names that it took the action already described (paragraph 5) for simplifying the procedure to be followed by the Commission when using its Plenary Powers for the purpose of validating generic names found to be invalid consequent upon the final rejection of the argument that the expression "nomenclature binaire" possessed a wider meaning than the expression "nomenclature binominale."

15. Oken's *Lehrbuch* being, in my opinion, a book which must be rejected as not satisfying the requirements of Proviso (*b*) to Article 25 (paragraph 11), it is necessary to consider whether any of the Oken names which, on the foregoing argument, are seen to be unavailable are nevertheless in such widespread use as to call for preservation under the Plenary Powers. This is a matter on which, for each group of the Animal Kingdom, only the specialists in that group are qualified to express an opinion. In the case of mammalogy it is already evident however that some authorities would be strongly opposed to the elimination of certain well-known Oken names now commonly used for important genera. Among these may be numbered first the late Dr. Osgood himself who would certainly have objected to the elimination of the names *Citellus*, *Panthera* and *Thos* (paragraph 13). Second, Mr. T. C. S. Morrison-Scott (Deputy Keeper, Department of Zoology, British Museum (Natural History), London), with whom and Dr. Edward Hindle (Scientific Director, Zoological Society of London) I had correspondence in 1946 and 1947 regarding the name *Pan* Oken as applied to the chimpanzee, has expressed himself as strongly opposed to the entire elimination of Oken's generic names for mammals. The relevant part of Mr. Morrison-Scott's letter is annexed to the present Report as Appendix 4. As will be there noted, Mr. Morrison-Scott points out that some of Oken's generic names have been accepted in such important works as Allen (G. M.), 1939, *Checklist of African Mammals* and Simpson (G. G.), 1945, *The Principles of Classification and a Classification of Mammals.*

16. Where a book fails to satisfy the requirements of Article 25, but the names in it are in general use or, if not all in use, can readily be assigned to their appropriate position in synonymy, it would be possible for the Commission to secure stability in the nomenclature in the group concerned by validating the whole book under its Plenary Powers. Accordingly, any name in such a book which was the oldest available name for a given genus would become the valid name for that genus, while names applicable to genera, for which there were older available names would disappear in synonymy. Theoretically, it would be possible for the Commission, if it so thought fit, to deal with Oken's *Lehrbuch* in this manner, that is, to validate it under the Plenary Powers. In fact, however, the adoption of this course would cause as much instability in nomenclature as would the disappearance of the Oken names, for the *Lehrbuch* would then need to be examined systematically, page by page, by specialists in all groups in the Animal Kingdom, since, although some Oken names have been brought into use, there are many more names included in the *Lehrbuch* which have been completely ignored and which it would then be necessary to take into account. This would be an extremely complicated and difficult task in view of the utter lack of consistency shown by Oken in the terminology applied by him to the species described in the *Lehrbuch*. This is well illustrated by the example given in the Report prepared by Dr. Jordan (Appendix 2). The virtual impossibility in many cases of determining whether a name was used as a generic name or was a trivial name printed with a capital initial letter would lead to endless difficulty in determining the status of the names in question, and at times would be virtually certain to lead to such confusion that the use of the Plenary Powers would be necessary to suppress the name in question. Moreover, even if ultimately, with occasional help from the Commission, the generic names employed in Oken's work could be reduced to some kind of order, there would still remain the difficulty presented at the species level of the treatment to be accorded to the specific names used by Oken, for (as already explained) though many of these are binominal (e.g. *Gulo quitensis*, the name for one of the sub-units of Species 1 in Division " b " of the first genus of the fifth Sippschaft), many also are trinominals (e.g. *Putorius americanus striatus*, the term applied to the first sub-unit of the second species of the same Division of the genus referred to above). I conclude therefore that any action to be taken by the Commission to secure availability for those of Oken's generic names which are in common use should certainly not take the form of using the Plenary Powers to validate Oken's *Lehrbuch* as a whole, for that course would give rise to more numerous and more serious difficulties then would follow from the rejection of the *Lehrbuch* under the normal operation of the *Règles* and would be calculated to cause far greater instability and confusion in nomenclature.

17. If therefore express action is to be taken to prevent the confusion and instability which would follow the elimination in synonymy of certain of Oken's generic names, that action must, it is suggested, be selective in character and directed exclusively towards meeting the particular ends in view. Fortunately, it is possible in this matter to draw upon the precedent set by the Commission when dealing with the very similar problem presented by the generic names used for insects by Geoffroy (E. L.) in his celebrated *Histoire abrégée des Insectes qui se trouvent aux Environs de Paris*, an admittedly non-binominal work published in 1762, many of the generic names published in which are however in general use. The problem presented by this book was considered by the Commission in Paris (Paris Session, 13th Meeting, Conclusions 14–16) (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4**: 366–370) ,and the decision then taken is, I consider, extremely relevant to the consideration of the action to be taken in regard to the *Lehrbuch* of Oken. The action taken by the Commission as regards Geoffroy's *Histoire abrégée* was threefold in character : (1) the Commission declared that this work did not satisfy the requirements of Article 25 and therefore that names appearing in it were not available under the *Règles* ; (2) the Commission at once used its Plenary Powers to validate one of the most important names thus found to be invalid (*Corixa* Geoffroy) ; (3) the Commission placed on record its view that " certain of the generic names published in the foregoing work, being in wide use, should certainly be validated in the interests of stability in nomenclature." In accordance with the last of these conclusions the Commission invited me, as the Secretary to the Commission, to confer with specialists in the various Orders of insects concerned, with a view to " the submission to the Commission " of " proposals for the validation, under the Plenary Powers, of such of the names concerned, the rejection of which would lead to instability or confusion in the nomenclature of the group concerned, so that, in the light of the statements so received, the Commission may validate such of the names concerned as may appear to it to be appropriate." The adoption of a similar procedure in the case of generic names published by Oken in his *Lehrbuch*, when these are found to be in general use, would seem to me to be both highly appropriate and extremely desirable.

18. In addition to the names of the three genera of Carnivora published by Oken on which (as explained in paragraph 8 above) there is an outstanding application by the late Dr. C. W. Stiles, the Commission has had before it for some time an application (Z.N.(S.)261) submitted by Professor Harold Kirby (*University of California, Berkeley, California, U.S.A.*) for the validation. under the Plenary Powers, of the generic name *Stentor* Oken, 1815 (Class Ciliophora). In agreement with Professor Kirby, the publication of this application was deferred until it could be published at the same time as the present Report. It is accordingly now published immediately after the present Report.

19. In March 1952 I issued a general appeal to specialists to furnish statements of their views on the question of the availability of names published in Oken's *Lehrbuch* and at the same time to furnish particulars of any generic names published by Oken currently in use in their respective groups which, in their opinion, ought to be preserved, if the Commission were to rule that in his *Lehrbuch* Oken did not satisfy the requirements of Article 25 and therefore that no name published in that work acquired the status of availability in virtue of having been so published (Hemming, 1952, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **7** : 195-196). None of the specialists who responded to the foregoing appeal considered that Oken's *Lehrbuch* was a nomenclatorially available work. A number of these specialists, however, furnished particulars relating to individual Oken names in common use for genera in their own groups which they recommended should be validated under the Plenary Powers, in order to prevent the disturbance and confusion in nomenclature which would otherwise be inevitable. These applications will be published in the *Bulletin* as soon as possible.

Summary of Conclusions

20. In the light of the evidence examined, and of the considerations advanced in the present Report, I now summarise, as follows, the conclusions which I have formed on the subject of the availability of the names published in the period 1815–1816 in Volume **3** (Zoologie) of Oken's *Lehrbuch der Naturgeschichte ;—*

(1) In Volume **3** (Zoologie) of the *Lehrbuch der Naturgeschichte* which was published in the period 1815–1816, Oken did not apply the principles of binominal nomenclature, as required by Proviso (*b*) to Article 25 of the *Règles*, as clarified by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 1948 (paragraphs 9–10).

(2) In consequence of (1) above, no name published by Oken in the foregoing work acquired any status in zoological nomenclature in virtue of having been so published (paragraph 11).

(3) In some groups of the Animal Kingdom, e.g. in mammalogy, certain generic names are commonly accepted with priority from Oken's *Lehrbuch*. In some cases genera to which these names are applied are well known and of wide distribution. The elimination of the Oken names for these genera would lead to instability and confusion in the nomenclature of the groups concerned (paragraphs 13–15).

(4) Availability for the Oken generic names now in common use could be provided by the use by the Commission of its Plenary Powers to render Volume **3** of Oken's *Lehrbuch* available under the *Règles* and thus to validate *en bloc* the new names published in that book. The adoption of this course in the case of Oken's *Lehrbuch* would however be open to strong objection, for the nomenclature employed by Oken in that work is so confused that the grant of availability to that work as a whole would be bound to give rise to numerous and serious difficulties by reason of the large number of names introduced by Oken which have hitherto been ignored (paragraph 16).

(5) Availability could be secured for such of Oken's generic names as are in common use and the disappearance of which in synonymy would give rise to instability and confusion by the selective use by the Commission of its Plenary Powers, in the same way that the Commission has already decided to use those powers in relation to the parallel case of the generic names published in 1762 by Geoffroy (E. L.) in his *Histoire abrégée des Insectes qui se trouvent aux Environs de Paris*. This is the course which I recommend should now be taken (paragraph 17).

FRANCIS HEMMING,

Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

Secretariat of the Commission :
28 Park Village East,
Regent's Park,
LONDON, N.W.1, England.
9th March, 1954.

APPENDIX 1

APPLICATION RELATING TO THE STATUS OF THE NAMES IN OKEN'S "LEHRBUCH DER NATURGESCHICHTE" SUBMITTED TO THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE BY DR. WILFRED H. OSGOOD IN MAY 1944

Are the names in Oken, 1815-1816, "Lehrbuch der Naturgeschichte" 3 (Zoologie), available under the Règles?

By WILFRED H. OSGOOD
(*Chicago Natural History Museum, Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.*)

Oken's names were especially brought to attention by J. A. Allen in 1902 (*Bull. Amer. Mus. nat. Hist.* **16** : 373–379). At this time Allen said : "Oken was almost as erratic and irregular in nomenclatorial matters as was Zimmermann in his *Specimen Zoologiae Geographicae*[1] published in 1777, but in some respects is less satisfactory, since he failed to cite authorities for the names used, and gave no reference to his sources of information. Both diagnosed generic, subgeneric and other groups, as well as species, under either vernacular or systematic names, as seemed to please their fancy, and employed the names given by previous authors as these authors used them, regardless of whether the generic portion of the name conformed or not to the genus to which they assigned the species. Yet they each had a 'system',—sadly defective, however, when tried by the nomenclatorial usages of today."

Allen then discussed a number of Oken's generic and specific names of mammals which might be adopted for use instead of those current at the time. Nowhere does he say that they must be used and his entire paper is factual rather than argumentative, his attitude being that of suspended judgment rather than conviction. In other words, his paper is that of a reporter rather than an advocate and what he says essentially is that, if Oken's names are acceptable, then certain changes are necessary.

Nevertheless, the Oken names have been accepted especially by British and American mammalogists and have been in general use for more than forty years. Among them are some of wide use not only in taxonomic but in general literature for some of the best known animals in the world. Examples are *Citellus* Oken, which replaced *Spermophilus* Cuvier for the very large group of ground squirrels of Asia and America, including species concerned in the transmission of disease and therefore dealt with in medical literature ; *Panthera* Oken, which has been adopted as a genus or subgenus for the larger cats including the lion, tiger, leopard and some others ; and *Thos* Oken for the jackals.

---

[1] The *Specimen Zoologiae* of Zimmermann has since been rejected by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature as a work which does not comply with the requirements of Article 25, Proviso (*b*). See *Opinion* 257.

In 1904 (*S.B. Ges. naturf. Fr. Berlin* **1904** : 55), only two years after Allen's paper, the German mammalogist Matschie demurred by saying : " Die in Oken's *Lehrbuch der Naturgeschichte* verwendeten Bezeichnungen dürfen deshalb nicht gebraucht werden, weil die Grundsätze der binaren Nomenklatur in diesem Buche nicht befolgt sind."

In 1927 Stiles and Orlemann (*Bull. U.S. hyg. Lab.* **145** : 29), in dealing with the Primates, said of Oken's work : " From our viewpoint the nomenclature used by Oken, 1816, pp. 1223–1232, is not in harmony with International Rules, is neither consistently binary nor consistently binominal, hence is not available under the Law of Priority."

In 1932 (*Trab. Mus. Cienc. nat.*, Madrid (Zool.) **57** : 106), Cabrera referred to Oken saying : " este autor no siguió la verdadera nomenclatura binaria, y por consiguiente sus nombres no deben admitirse." (Since, this author has consistently refused to recognise Oken's names and recently has issued a detailed defence of his position (1943, *Ciencia*, Mexico **4** : 108–111).

The fact remains that Oken's names have attained wide currency in spite of expressed objection to them. They seem to be similar to the names of Gronovius, which were accepted by the Commission under *Opinion* 20 and later rejected by exercise of Plenary Power under *Opinion* 89. In fact it might well be argued that they are even less deserving than the names of Gronovius. Regardless of interpretation of the Code, a ruling on them appears to be necessary, since it is now a question of " greater confusion than uniformity " apparently subject only to the exercise of the Plenary Power.[2]

Postscript (extract from a letter, dated 13th September 1944, to the Secretary to the Commission) : In regard to Oken's *Lehrbuch*, I would prefer to see it entirely suppressed. Allen, who first uncovered it and who has been followed considerably, did not make a very good case for it, and later authors, including both Stiles and Stejneger, I believe, have argued that it does not conform to the Code.

---

[2] It should be noted that *Opinion* 20 was rendered at a date prior to the grant to the International Commission of Plenary Powers to suspend the rules in certain cases. That *Opinion*, therefore, dealt only with the sole question, with which the International Commission was then empowered to deal, namely the Interpretation of the Code, the question then submitted being whether Gronovius in 1763, *Zoophylacium*, had " applied the principles of binary nomenclature " as required by proviso (b) to Article 25 of the International Code. The question dealt with in *Opinion* 89 is entirely different from that dealt with in *Opinion* 20, since *Opinion* 89 is not concerned in any way with the interpretation of the Code but with the question whether or not the Plenary Powers conferred upon the International Commission at Monaco in 1913 should or should not be used to suppress Gronovius, 1763, *Zoophylacium*, and certain other works.

APPENDIX 2

On the system of classification used by Oken (L.) in his "Lehrbuch der Naturegeschichte" of 1816

By KARL JORDAN, Ph.D., F.R.S.
(*British Museum (Natural History), Zoological Museum, Tring*)

(Extract from a letter dated 10th June 1944, from Dr. Karl Jordan (then President of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature) to the Secretary to the Commission)

In order to understand Oken's classification and nomenclature, two main points must be kept in mind. (1) Animals were created according to a definite plan: a tribe (which he calls *Sippschaft*) consists of four genera in every family (Oken's *Zunft*); the number of species in each genus varies. Often there are so many kinds known that Oken subdivides the genus concerned. These divisions and subdivisions of a *Gattung* are marked by letters (e.g. the letters "*a*," "*b*," "*c*," etc.). These are usually followed by one or more Latin names. The classification and nomenclature used are complicated. (2) Apart from the part relating to European animals, Oken's *Lehrbuch* is mainly a compilation. When uncertain about the systematic position of an animal, Oken often refers to the same animal in different places and gives more than one Latin name for it. The names so given are usually taken from the literature. He cites no authors' names and gives no bibliographical references for the Latin names cited. At the end of the volume he gives a short bibliography.

The nature of Oken's system of classification may be illustrated by an example. I therefore give below his classification for the first genus of his fifth tribe (5 *Sippschaft*, 1 *Gattung*), from which I have omitted his descriptions.

Classification used by Oken for the first genus of his fifth tribe

5. Sippschaft

1. Gattung. Muffer [The German names—often spaced—are mostly Oken's invention.]
    - *a*. Dächse
    - *a*. *Meles*, Dachs;
        - 1. Art. *M. vulgaris*, *Ursus Meles*, *Taxus*, gen. D., Gräving;
        - 2. Art. *M. americana*, *Ursus labradorius*;
        - 3. Art. *M. indica*;
          Der lang bekannte *Meles indicus* ist augenscheinlich *Galeopithecus!*
    - *b*. Stunk, *Mephitis*, *Viverra*, Stinthier, Muffer;
        - 1. Art. Zweistreifiger St. [No Latin name cited]
            - *a*. Teufelskind oder Stinkthier (*Viv. Mephitis*);
            - *b*. Yaguara, *Zorilla*, Muffer von Chili;
              Here probably a Muffer from Chili, but the white on frons and occiput broader, more probably Grunzer or Blaser at Magellan's Strait, Stinkfüchse, *Putorius americanus*. Stinkthier in Luisiana, Schweitzer, Ortohula, Teufelskind and *Chinche*. (translation)

c. Gulo quitensis, Atok oder Zorra (Fuchs);

As the Atok has been placed in *Gulo*, one should expect that its dentition would be the same; but we doubt it. (translation)

2. Art. Fünfstreifiger St.; [no Latin name cited]

a. Putorius americanus striatus (*Viv. Putorius*);

At the end of the description of colour and habits there occurs—over the page—the name *Putorius americanus striatus* (int'd K.J.)

b. [Oken made no entry under this sub-item. int'd K.J.]

c. Conepate (*Viv. Putorius*); [sei the equivalent of the Latin *seu* K.J.]

Coneptl, amerik. Iltis gestreiften.

3. Art. Einstreifiger St.; [no Latin name cited]

a. Cinche (*Viv. Mephitis*); sei Yzquiepatl (schlechthin);

b. Mapurito (*Viv. Mapurito*); . . . sei *Viverra Putorius*

[The word "Mapurito" is here used as a specific name. int'd K.J.]

c. Iltis St.

1. Art. Geflekter St.; [no Latin name cited]

a. Mapurito oder *Mafutiliqui* (*Viv. Zorilla*); [The word "Mapurito" is here used as a vernacular name. int'd K.J.]

[If here *Zorilla ?* Query *Zorinna* or *Anna ?* (transl.)]

b. Chingha (*Viverra Chingha*);

c. Zorille; sei eine mit *Mafutiliqui* und *Ortohula*

d. Gräving, *Grison :* [The word "Gräving" is slightly spaced. K.J.]

1. Art. Zügel G.; [no Latin name cited]

a. Chinche (*Viv. vittata*); Sei Maikal oder Yagiane.—

b. Viverra vittata, Grison :

Mustela gujanensis, Foine von Güana;

Huron minor, Martes Grison :

[*Note :* The above are not *vittata* but are two additional distinct species, each with its own description. int'd. K.J.]

Perhaps here Yzquiepatl (*Viv. Vulpecula*), Teufelskind and Chinche from Brazil. *Grison* (*Viv. vittata*) and *Galera* belong together ?, the former probably here. (translation)

e. Schnopp, *Tayra :*

1. Art. Gelbkehliger Sch.; [no Latin name cited]

a. Mustela barbara, Tayra oder grose Wiesel;

Einerlei Gr. Marder von Güana, *Must. poliocephalus.*

b. M. lanata, kl. *Foina* von Güana;

c. Mustela canadensis, Pekan;

There are three animals in Paragay similar to the marten, pine marten and polecat, but larger . . . They are *Huron minor, major*, Yaguare; *Huron major* (*Furo* m.); *Martes Tayra*; . . . Is *Mustela barbara* different ? It seems to be *Ichneumon de Yzquiepatl* (*Viv. Quasja*). Pekan (*Must. canadens.*), kleine *Foina* von Güana (*Must. lanata*), Tayra (*M. barbara*). (translation)

2. Art. Schwarzer Sch. [no Latin name cited]

a. Yzquiepatl, seu Vulpecula quae Maizium torrefactum semulatur colore (*Viv. Vulpecula*);

> There are two other small foxes of this sort. One is generally called *Yzquiepatl* . . . The other is called Conepatl seu *Vulpecula puerilis*, . . . (translation)

b. Stinkthier, (*Viv. Putorius*)

3. Art. Brauner Sch. ;

Ichneumon de Izquiepatl (*Viv. Quasja*)

> One could put *Coase* here if anteriorly it has five toes. (translation)

f. Järf, *Gulo, Ursus ;*

1. Art. *G. vulgaris, Urs. Gulo, Hyaena, Glouton, Rosomak,* Filfrass (Rahmfrass), Schnopp, gem. J. ;

APPENDIX 3

On the question of the status of names in Oken, 1815-1816, "Lehrbuch der Naturgeschichte" 3 (Zoologie)

By ANGEL CABRERA
(*Eva Peron, F.C.N.G.R., Argentina*)

(Extract from a letter dated 20th July 1950 from Dr. Cabrera to the Secretary to the Commission)

I have read very attentively the fourth volume of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*. The question about the names in Oken's *Lehrbuch* interests me very much. I received some time ago your request regarding my paper on this subject, but unfortunately I had not myself a copy of this paper and was therefore forced to ask for one from Mexico, where it was published seven years ago (in *Ciencia* **4** (Nos. 4-5) published on 20th October 1943).

My reasons for rejecting Oken's names are similar in every way to those advanced by Hershkowitz in 1949 (*J. Mammal.* **30**: 289-301). The following is a translation of a part of my paper :—

> Though this book [Oken's *Lehrbuch*] was published in 1816, naturalists in general ignored Oken's names until 1902, when J. A. Allen gave a list of those which, in his opinion, ought to be accepted in Mammalogy. He did not do so, however, without giving the warning that Oken was "erratic and irregular in nomenclatorial matters" and that his manner of naming animals was "sadly defective when tried by the nomenclatorial uses of today." From that date however North American zoologists began to use these names, and their example was soon followed by the Europeans. A noteworthy exception was Paul Matschie (1904), who rejected them on the ground that Oken never followed the true binary nomenclature, a very important opinion, coming, as it did, from a fellow-countryman of the author under criticism. Many years afterwards, when studying the nomenclature of the apes, Stiles and Orleman (1927) expressed the same views. . . . As said by Stiles and Orleman, the author of a book or publication must be "consistently binary and consistently binominal" in order that the names in his book may be accepted. Indeed, if an author does not practise binary and binominal nomenclature, it would be absurd to accept one or two of his names, merely because they are accidentally formed of two words. This being so, it is not possible to consider Oken as an author applying the principles of binary nomenclature in his *Lehrbuch*. . . . Some of Oken's genera (Gattungen) have a name composed of two words in violation of the principle established by Linnaeus and now embodied in Article 8 of the *Règles*. Among the genera of fishes, there is one named "*Regalecus lanceolatus*" and another has as its name "*Lepidopus gorunensis*". Many of the genera have not even a technical name,

> being cited only under the vernacular German name, such as "Schlenderschwanz" among reptiles and "Muffer" among mammals. In the genus "*Lepidopus goranensis*" there is found a species named "*Botrichthys sinensis*", whereas the name of another is "*Botrichthoides oculatus.*" The genus of reptiles "Schlenderschwanz" includes the species "*Stellio Lacerta caudiverbera,*" "*Stellio fimbriatus*" and "*Stellio tetradactylus,*" while later another genus is named *Stellio* and contains other different species. . . . Oken's specific names are frequently binomial, but many of them are trinomial and even plurinomial. Thus, the orang outang appears as "*Faunus indicus, rufus.*" If we do not see here a trinomial denomination, we shall be forced to regard this expression not as a name at all, but as an abbreviated description such as those used by Seba, Brisson, etc. In the genus *Cercopithecus*, we find similar instances: among its species there is a "*Cercopithecus angolensis major,*" a "*Cercopithecus angolensis alius*" and a "*Simia nigra magnitudinis mediae.*"

Other examples given in my paper are the same as those pointed out by Hershkowitz. To sum up, I conclude by saying that Oken's nomenclature "is merely an irregular mixture of generic names, sometimes in Latin and sometimes in German, indistinctly composed of one or of two words, with specific names as often binomial as uninomial or polynomial. It is impossible, in my opinion, to use the names belonging to such a system of nomenclature, if we reject those given by Frisch, Gronow or Catesby. To accept these names as valid, in clear breach of the principles of Article 25 of the *Règles Internationales*, would be to declare the futility of the *Règles* themselves or, at least, to agree with those that ignore them".

APPENDIX 4

On the question of the use of generic names published in Oken's "Lehrbuch der Naturgeschichte"

(Extract from a letter, dated 18th January 1947, from Mr. T. C. S. Morrison-Scott, Deputy Keeper, Department of Zoology, British Museum (Natural History) to the Secretary to the Commission)

I think that the elimination of Oken's *Lehrbuch* would be a very retrograde step, so far as mammals are concerned. At last we are getting some sort of order into things. Works like Allen (1939) *Checklist of African Mammals* and Simpson (1945) *The Principles of Classification and a Classification of Mammals* are the foundations on which we now build and there is a growing feeling among mammalogists that the foundations should not be disturbed. The need for stability in order to take stock of the mass of undigested knowledge overrides the following of rules for the sake of pedantic uniformity—or that is the way I see it.

Both Allen and Simpson use Oken's names—not merely *Pan* but *Panthera*, *Genetta*, etc,. and it would be crazy to eliminate these names.

ON THE NEED FOR VALIDATING THE NAME " STENTOR " OKEN, 1815 (CLASS CILIOPHORA) FOR USE IN ITS ACCUSTOMED SENSE

By HAROLD KIRBY
(*University of California, Berkeley, California, U.S.A.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)261)

Several species of well-known ciliates have for more than a century usually been placed in the genus *Stentor*, and because of the particular value of these ciliates for research and in class instruction, as well as the frequency with which they come to the attention of microscopists, there is a large literature under the name *Stentor*. The name has not yet been placed in the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*. Examination of the nomenclatural status of the genus has shown that several points of confusion, hitherto usually ignored, must be cleared up. The name for the genus and its type species should be decisively established as soon as possible by appropriate action by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

The first record of observation of ciliates now included in *Stentor* was read by Abraham Trembley to the Royal Society of London in 1744 and was published in 1745 in the *Philosophical Transactions*, **43** : 180 ff. He reported having seen in fresh water animalcula which De Réaumur judged to belong to the general class of Polypi. Part of the paper is devoted to an account of clustering Polypi, which Trembley stated were named by De Réaumur " les Polypes en bouquet " ; these were colonial vorticellids, probably *Zoothamnium*. Trembley also wrote of small Polypi of a different sort from those that are found in clusters, which De Réaumur thought proper to distinguish by the name of Tunnel-like Polypi. He gave a sufficiently informative account of these animalcula and their manner of division so that it is evident that he dealt with *Stentor*. He reported being acquainted with three species of these Polypi, which are respectively green, blue, and white.

In *Employment for the Microscope* (1753, pp. 330-334) Henry Baker wrote of Funnel-Animals which he found attached to a parcel of snail's eggs, and he quoted Trembley's account, stating in a footnote that he was pleased to find that de Réaumur and Trembley had ideas of the creature so nearly like his own. He gave a figure (pl. 13, fig. 1) which evidently depicts a species of the genus known later as *Stentor*, though he supplied no sufficient information by means of which one could identify it with *St. polymorphus*, as did Ehrenberg (1838, *Infusionsth.* : 263).

Figures of an organism of this group were published in 1755 by Rosel von Rosenhof (*Insectenbelust.*, **3** : pl. 94, figs. 7, 8) who discussed it in the text (: 585) under the name " der schallemeynähnliche Affterpolyp." The figures represent one of the colorless species, which Ehrenberg (1838, *Infusionsth.* : 262) considered to be the one that he later named *St. mülleri* : but the species represented by Rösel cannot actually be identified.

The scientific name first given to a ciliate that now belongs to the genus *Stentor* was *Hydra stentoria* Linnaeus (1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 817). The name was applied to the representation of the organism by Rösel. Under the name, Linnaeus referred to four of Rösel's figures (*Insectenbel.*, **3** : pl. 94, figs. 5, 6, 7, 8). Figures 5 and 6 depict a rotifer ; Ehrenberg (1838, *Infusionsth.* : 404) included a reference to them in the synonymy of *Lacinularis socialis*. Thus the name given by Linnaeus in 1758 was applied both to a rotifer and the ciliate.

Linnaeus later (1767, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 12) **1** : 1321) published an emendation of the specific name as *stentorea*, and under *H. stentorea* referred to an extended list of references : the accounts by Trembley and Baker and the latter's figure which I have mentioned : Rösel's figs. 7 and 8 (not 5 and 6) ; references by Ledermuller and by Pallas. Linnaeus (1767) referred to Rösel's figures 5 and 6 under *Hydra socialis*. He had evidently restricted his concept of *H. stentorea* so far as the original reference of 1758 was concerned, to Rösel's figures that actually represented the ciliate. Pallas (1766) used the name *Brachionus stentoreus*, with varieties *alba*, *viridis*, and *caeruleus ;* he removed the stentorid of Linnaeus to that genus, along with some rotifers and vorticellids.

O. F. Müller, recognising that the ciliate dealt with by Linnaeus could not be put in the genera *Hydra* or *Brachionus*, included it in *Vorticella*. Under *Vorticella stentorea* (1773, *Verm. terrest. fluviat.* : 111), he quoted the description of *Hydra stentorea* by Linnaeus. In the genus he also treated of several species that were in Linnaeus's genus *Vorticella*, together with a heterogeneous assemblage of ciliates and some rotifers. In this work Müller dealt with two other stentorid ciliates, which he named *Vorticella nigra* (*op. cit.* : 96) and *V. polymorpha* (*op. cit.* : 98). Later (1786, *Animalc. Inf.* : 262) he described a third species, *Vorticella multiformis*. A peritrich dealt with in the latter work is *Vorticella versatilis* (*op. cit.* : 281, pl. 39, figs. 14-17). In that peritrich individuals occur abundantly in the periphery of large, gelatinous masses.

Vorticella stentorea was included in the genus *Linza* Schrank, 1802, by Schrank (1802, 1803). This genus contained the colonial peritrich, then widely known as *Ulva pruniformis*, which was Müller's *Vorticella versatilis*, and of which the currently used name is *Ophrydium versatile ;* Müller's *Vorticella flosculosa* (1786, *Animalc. Inf.* : 304, pl. 43, figs. 16-20), which is the colonial rotifer known later as *Lacinularia socialis :* and Müller's *Vorticella socialis* (*op. cit.* : 304, pl. 43, figs. 13-15), which is in part also *Lacinularia socialis*. Schrank's genus *Linza* was a complex of a peritrich, a rotifer, and a stentorid ciliate. Neave (*Nomenclator Zoologicus*) lists *Linza* as in Rotifera.

The stentorids that had been named by Müller (1786) *Vorticella nigra* and *V. polymorpha* were placed by Schrank (1803) in the genus *Ecclissa*, as *E. nigra* and *E. viridis*, along with various species of Müller's *Vorticella*.

Bütschli (1889 in Bronn, *Klass. Ord. Thierreiches*, **1** : 1728) listed *Ecclissa* and *Linza* pp. Schrank in the synonymy of *Stentor*. Stein (1876, *Organ. Infusionsth.* : 221) had written of the injustice of the neglect suffered by Schrank's names, but recognised the futility of attempting to revive one or the other of them for the stentorid ciliates. The history of those names is complicated and obscure, and they have never come into use. To complicate the matter still further, I find that Lamouroux *et. al.* (1824, *Hist. nat. Zooph.*, **2** : 291) refer to the genus *Ecclissa* established by Ocken (*sic*) for vorticellids, and to *Linze*, a genus established by Guettard in sponges. Also there is *Eclissa* Modeer (*A.*), 1790, emended in Agassiz (1842-46, *Nomenclator Zoologicus*) to *Ecclissa* Modeer, in Vorticellina.

These names are associated with the older history of the nomenclature of stentorid ciliates, and so have been discussed, but they are not necessarily important in relation to the present problem. The type of *Linza* Schrank may be considered to be *Vorticella flosculosa* Müller, which is the rotifer *Lacinularia socialis* : and that of *Ecclissa* Schrank may be considered to be one of the peritrichs he included in it. Thus these problems are removed to other groups than that which now concerns us, though it would be well if the Commission used its Plenary Powers to suppress the names *Linza* Schrank and *Ecclissa* Schrank, as well as *Eclissa* Modeer.

Oken (1815, *Lehrb. Naturgesch.*, Theil **3**, Abt. 1 : 45) applied the name *Stentor* to the same group of organisms as that in Schrank's genus *Linza*, though he did not refer to that fact. In the genus he gave three species : *St. solitarius* Oken, 1815 (*Vorticella stentorea* renamed) ; *St. socialis*, which was the rotifer *Lacinularia socialis ;* and *St. pruniformis* otherwise known as *Ulva pruniformis* or *Linza pruniformis* (*Ophrydium versatile*). Oken (1815) also listed the genus *Ecclissa*, with *E. nigra* (*Vorticella nigra*) and *E. viridis* (*Vorticella viridis*) as the species. Oken had distributed the species within the group we now know as *Stentor* into two genera, *Ecclissa* in his listing containing only members of that group. *Stentor* containing a heterogeneous assemblage of organisms, one of which belonged to the group in which we are presently interested.

The name *Stentor* Oken, 1815, was preoccupied. Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire (1812, *Ann. Mus. Nat. Hist.* **19** : 107) had proposed the name *Stentor* for a genus of South American monkeys, listing six species. For that group of howling monkeys, however, two generic names had already been supplied. *Stentor* Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire, 1812, is antedated by *Alouatta* Lacépède, 1799, and by *Mycetes* Illiger, 1811 (Palmer, 1904, *Index generum mammalium*, *North Am. Fauna*, No. 23). Consequently, *Stentor* has never been in use among mammalogists, and is often neglected even as a synonym.

A comparable case is that of *Necator* Stiles, 1903, which was dealt with by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at the 7th Meeting in Paris, July, 1948 (*Off. Record Proceedings* : 301-302)[1]. It was found by Mr. Hemming that the above generic name is a junior homonym of *Necator* Sclater and Saunders, 1896, an emendation of *Nicator*, Finsch and Hartlaub, 1870, a genus in the Class Aves. *Necator* has not been in use by ornithologists, *Nicator* having always been the name by which the genus is known. At this meeting, the Commission used its Plenary Powers to suppress *Necator* Sclater and Saunders, 1896, and to validate the generic name *Necator* Stiles, 1903.

---

[1] See *Opinion* 201 (1954, *Ops. Decls. int. Comm. zool. Nomencl.* 3 : 267-274).

Another aspect of this problem is its relation to a matter that came to the attention of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at its 13th Meeting in Paris, July, 1948 (*Off. Record Proceedings* : 365-366). It concerned a proposal that had been made by Stiles for addition to the *Official List of Generic Names* of three genera of Carnivora first published by Oken (1815-16) in his *Lehrbuch der Naturgeschichte*, and an application by Osgood for a ruling on the question of availability of names first published in Oken's *Lehrbuch*. The Commission agreed to take into consideration as soon as possible the question of a ruling on the availability of Oken's names, and to defer a decision on the application by Stiles for addition of three of Oken's genera of Carnivora to the *Official List* until there had been a decision on the availability of those names.

Since *Stentor* Oken, 1915, is a name also published in the *Lehrbuch* in question, its placement in the *Official List of Generic Names* is subject to the same consideration.

Several other names have been proposed for the ciliates of this generic group. Bory (1824, Lamouroux, Bory de Saint-Vincent, et Eud. Deslongchamps, *Enc. méth., Hist. nat. Zooph.*, **2** : 533, 697) gave the name *Stentorina* to a genus which included the stentorids which Müller had grouped in *Vorticella* : *V. polymorpha*, *V. nigra*, and *V. multiformis*. This was the first bringing together of these species into a single independent genus. Bory's concept of their relationship was obviously far superior to that of Oken. Bory did, however, carry on an error that others had made before him, in giving the names *Stentorina Roëselii* and *S. biloba* to a rotifer, the one later known as *Lacinularia socialis*.

The generic name *Tubaria* was proposed by Thienemann (1828, *Lehrbuch Zool.* : 12), since the name *Stentor* had been used for a genus of apes by Geoffroy. He gave the species name *T. viridis*, which according to Ehrenberg (1838) is *Stentor polymorphus*. I have not been able to refer to Thienemann's book, but the name has no significance for the present nomenclatural problem.

Reichenbach (1828, *Zoologie* in *Allg. Taschenb. Naturw.*, Th. **5**, 1 : 95) substituted the name *Stentorella* for *Stentor* Ok. *non* Geoffr. He did not refer to any species. This name was neglected for more than a century, not even being included in nomenclatural indices (Agassiz, 1842-6 ; Sherborn, 1902). Recently Bhatia (1936, *Fauna Br. Ind., Prot : Ciliophora :* 234) noted preoccupation of *Stentor* for a genus of Mammalia and adopted instead *Stentorella* Reichenbach. Bhatia neglected the prior claim of *Stentorina*, if substitution is to be made, and his proposal to use *Stentorella* is invalid.

Another problem exists in regard to identification of the type species of *Stentor* Oken, 1815. When proposed, it contained only the one heterotrich *St. solitarius* Oken, 1815, along with the peritrich and rotifer. *St. solitarius* is a name supplied as equivalent to *Vorticella stentorea* Müller, 1773, so stated by Oken. It is also equivalent to *Hydra stentoria* Linnaeus, 1758. The trail of references occurring in the different authors' works goes back to Linnaeus.

But the same or equivalent names were not necessarily applied to the same organisms, and species identification of the ciliates as named and described by these authors is not possible.

Ehrenberg (1832, *Abh. Akad. Wiss. Berlin*, **1831** : 99) substituted the name *Stentor mülleri* E. for *Vorticella stentorea* Müller. A recognisable figure of *Stentor mülleri* was published by Ehrenberg (1837, *op. cit.* **1835** : pl. 1, fig. 16). A full, illustrated account of the species was provided by Ehrenberg (1838, *Infusionsth.* : 262). In that work Ehrenberg listed *Stentorina mülleri* Bory de Saint-Vincent, 1824 in the synonymy of *Stentor mülleri*. I have been unable to find that Bory used that name, though he did give *Stentorina stentorea* for Müller's *Vorticella stentorea*, a fact that Ehrenberg did not refer to in the synonymy in discussion.

Ehrenberg (1832, *op. cit.* : 99) stated that *Stentor mülleri* was *Vorticella stentorea* Müller, and in 1838 he listed *St. solitarius* Oken in the synonymy of *St. mülleri*. *St. solitarius* is the type, being the only ciliate in Oken's genus *Stentor* at the time it was proposed. Prior to Ehrenberg's accounts of 1832, 1837, and especially 1838 it is impossible to tell what species of colourless stentorids are referred to by the names that were given. The description of *Stentor mülleri* by Ehrenberg can, as Mr. Hemming suggested, be designated by the Commission as that to be accepted for the nominal type species of *Stentor* Oken, 1815. Since 1830 the specific names of this nominal species, *solitarium* Oken or the older *stentoria* or *stentorea*, have not been in use. It would be undesirable to revive them. The Commission should consider suppressing those specific names and designating the type species of *Stentor* as *St. mulleri* Ehrenberg, 1832 (*Abh. Konig Ak. Wiss. Berlin*. **1831** : 99).

There is not complete agreement about the taxonomic status of *Stentor mülleri*. Stein (1867, *Org. Infusionsth.* Abt. **2** : 223, 229) maintained that *St. mülleri* is no more than a colourless form of *St. polymorphus* (*i.e.*, without zoochlorellæ), and placed (: 247) *Hydra stentorea* L., 1758 ; *Vorticella stentorea* Müller, 1773 ; *Stentor solitarius* Oken, 1815 ; and *Stentorina stentorea* Bory, 1824 in the synonymy of *Stentor Roëselii* Ehrbg. This species like *St. mülleri* is colourless and may occur in a gelatinous lorica. *Stentor mülleri* is recognised, however, in recent literature in protozoology.

In his list of proposed *Nomina Conservanda* Apstein (1915, *Sitzungsber. Gesell. Naturf. Freunde Berlin* **1915** : 123) included *Stentor* Oken, 1815, and gave as the representative species (" eine art gennant, für welche die Gattung erhalten bleiben soll ") *polymorphus* Müll., 1773. However, under Article 30, that species is excluded as the type species of *Stentor*, since it was not included under the generic name at the time of publication.

The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is faced with a problem in considering the placing of the name of this important ciliate genus on the *Official List of Generic Names*. If it is decided that new names in Oken's *Lehrbuch* are available, *Stentor* Oken, 1815, may be preserved by suppression of *Stentor* Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire, 1812. If it is decided that the new names in

Oken's *Lehrbuch* are not available, the problem of selecting a name for these ciliates must be considered further. Perhaps *Stentorina* Bory de Saint-Vincent, 1824, could be adopted, with the type species *Vorticella polymorpha* Müller, 1773. A change of so well-known and long used a generic name as *Stentor* should be avoided if possible.

References

Apstein, C., 1915. Nomina conservanda. *Sitzungsbericht der Gesellschaft naturforschender Freunde zu Berlin*, **1915** : 119-202.

Baker, Henry, 1753. *Employment for the microscope.* (London.)

Bhatia, B. L., 1936. Protozoa : Ciliophora. *The fauna of British India, including Ceylon and Burma.* (London, Taylor & Francis.)

Bory de Saint-Vincent, J. B., 1824. Microscopiques *in* Lamouroux, Bory de Saint-Vincent, et Eud. Deslongchamps : Histoire naturelle des zoophytes, ou animaux rayonnes. pp. 515-543. *Encyclopedie Méthodique.* (Paris.)

Bory de Saint-Vincent, J. B., 1824. Stentorine ; *Stentorina in* Lamouroux, Bory de Saint-Vincent, et Eud. Deslongchamps : Histoire naturelle des zoophytes, ou animaux rayonnés, pp. 697-700. *Encyclopédie Méthodique.* (Paris.)

Ehrenberg, C. G., 1832. Uber die Entwickelung und Lebensdauer der Infusionsthiere ; nebst ferneren Beitragen zu einer Vergleichung ihrer organischen Systeme. *Abhandlungen der Königlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, **1831** : 1-154.

Ehrenberg, C. G., 1837. Zusätze zur Erkenntnis grosser organischer Ausbildung in den kleinsten thierischen Organismen. *Abhandlungen der Königlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, **1835** : 151-180.

Ehrenberg, C. G., 1838. *Die Infusionsthierchen als vollkommene Organismen.* (Leipzig, Leopold Voss.)

Geoffroy Saint-Hilaire, I., 1812. Tableau des Quadrumanes, ou des Animaux composant le premier Ordre de la Classe des Mammifères. *Annales du Muséum d'Histoire Naturelle*, **19** : 85-122.

Ledermuller, M. F., 1764. *Amusement mocroscopique tant pour l'esprit, que pour les yeux.* (Nuremberg.)

Linnaeus, C., 1758. *Systema Naturae, edition decima.* Tomus I. (Holmiae.)

Linné, Caroli A., 1767. *Systema Naturae.* ed. duodecima. (Holmiae.)

Müller, O. F., 1773. *Vermium terrestrium et fluviatilium.* (Hauniae et Lipsiae.)

Müller, O. F., 1786. *Animalcula infusoria fluviatilia et marina.* (Hauniae.)

Oken, L., 1815. *Lehrbuch der Naturgeschichte.* Dritter Theil. Zoologique. Erste Abth. Fleischlose Thiere. (Jena, Schmid und Com.)

Reichenbach, L., 1828. Zoologie oder Naturgeschichte des Tierreichs. *Erstes Bd. in Allgemeine Taschenbibliothek der Naturwissenschaften.* fünfter Th. (Dresden, Hilschersche Buchh.)

Rösel von Rosenhof, A. J., 1755. *Der monatlich-herausgegebenen Insecten-Belustigung.* **3** : 585-596. Vier fünf und Sechs und Neunzigste Supplementstabelle. Der gesellige, keulenförmige Affterpolyp. Tab. XCIV, XCV und XCVI.

Schrank, F. von P. von., 1802. *Briefe naturhistorische, physikalische und ökonomische Inhalts an Nau.* (Erlangen.)

Schrank, F. von P. von., 1803. *Fauna boica.* **30.** 2. (Nürnberg.)

Sherborn, C. D., 1931. *Index Animalium*, pt. 25. (London, British Museum.)

Stein, F., 1867. *Der Organismus der Infusionsthiere.* II. Abthteilung. (Leipzig, Engelmann.)

Trembley, Abraham, 1745. Observations upon several newly discovered species of freshwater Polypi. *Philosophical Transactions.* London. **43** (Numb. 474) : 169-183.

REPORT ON THE STATUS OF THE GENERIC NAME "STENTOR" OKEN, 1815 (CLASS CILIOPHORA, SUB-CLASS CILIATA)

By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

(Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)261)

In correspondence relating to the name *Entamoeba* Casagrandi and Barbagallo, 1895, Professor Harold Kirby (University of California, Berkeley, Cal., U.S.A.) drew my attention to the fact that the name universally applied to the well-known genus of Ciliates known as *Stentor* was invalid and suggested that the problems involved should be studied by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature as a preliminary to name *Stentor* Oken, 1815, being placed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*. I at once asked Professor Kirby to prepare a statement of the case for consideration by the Commission, and this he kindly undertook to do at the first opportunity. The investigation has proved unexpectedly complicated, for it was found not only that the generic name *Stentor* Oken is invalid, being a junior homonym of the name *Stentor* St. Hilaire, 1812 (as was already known), but also that no effective type selection had apparently ever been made for the genus *Stentor* Oken and further that the identity of the only originally included species (*Stentor solitarius* Oken, 1815) that could be regarded as being a member of the genus as at present universally understood was open to doubt. All of these questions are dealt with fully in the paper prepared by Professor Kirby, which is now laid before the Commission for consideration.

2. In submitting this paper, Professor Kirby deliberately stopped short of formulating concrete proposals for the consideration of the Commission, asking me, as Secretary to the Commission, to undertake this task. This I consented to do and the present Report has accordingly been prepared for the consideration of the Commission. When the present Report was in draft, I submitted it to Professor Kirby, who notified me that he was in agreement with the conclusions and recommendations now submitted.

3. In approaching the present task, I started with the premise that in the case of a name such as *Stentor* Oken every responsible zoologist would recognise how grave would be the confusion if it were found necessary to reject that name for purely technical nomenclatorial reasons and would strongly support the use by the Commission of its Plenary Powers to prevent so diastrous a result. In the following paragraphs I deal briefly with each of the three problems which, as Professor Kirby explained, arise in the present case.

4. *On the measures necessary to provide availability for the generic name* Stentor *Oken*, 1815 : The first step necessary in any plan to preserve the current use of the generic name *Stentor* would be the suppression, under the Plenary Powers, of the older generic name *Stentor* St. Hilaire, 1812 ; no possible objection could be raised to this course, since, as Professor Kirby pointed out, the name *Stentor* St. Hilaire is a name that was applied to a genus of monkeys which has at least two older available names. Once St. Hilaire's *Stentor* had been removed from the field in this way, the name *Stentor* Oken, 1815, would cease to be invalid, as the junior homonym of another generic name. The next question to be considered is whether Oken, in his *Lehrbuch der Naturgeschichte*, consistently applied the principles of binominal nomenclature (as required by Proviso (b) to Article 25) and therefore whether the name *Stentor* Oken is an available name. On this general subject I have submitted a Report (Z.N.(S.)153) to* the Commission in accordance with a request addressed to me by it at its Paris Session, in which I reach the conclusion that Oken did not, in the *Lehrbuch*, satisfy the provision cited above and therefore that new names published in the *Lehrbuch* did not acquire any rights under the Law of Priority. At the same time I draw attention to the fact that, if the Commission accept the conclusion reached in my Report, the names in the *Lehrbuch* will fall to be dealt with under the special procedure laid down by the Thirteenth

---

*See pp.193—201 of the present volume.

International Congress of Zoology for the purpose of validating with the utmost despatch generic names of importance that might in such cases be found to be invalid (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 63-66). Clearly the name *Stentor* Oken, 1815, would come under this heading and I accordingly recommend that, simultaneously with the adoption of my Report on the status of Oken's *Lehrbuch*, the name *Stentor* Oken should be validated under the Plenary Powers.

5. *Certain old generic names associated with the* Stentor *problem* : Professor Kirby pointed out that the name *Linza* Schrank, 1802, a name which has never been used, is a potential danger to the name *Stentor* Oken, since no type species has ever been selected for Schrank's genus and some of the species originally included in it are stentorids. I fully support, therefore, the conclusion reached by Professor Kirby that this name should now be suppressed under the Plenary Powers and thus rendered incapable of causing confusion in the literature. Similarly, I support Professor Kirby's conclusion that the long-forgotten name *Eclissa* Modeer, 1790, and its variant *Ecclissa* Schrank, 1802, should be suppressed under the Plenary Powers.

6. *On the type species of the genus* Stentor *Oken*, 1815 : As already noted in the present Report, no nominal species appears ever to have been validly selected to be the type species of the genus *Stentor* Oken, 1815 ; the selection of a type species is naturally an indispensable preliminary to the definition of the genus. Professor Kirby pointed out that *Stentor solitarius* Oken, 1815, is the only originally included species, the selection of which as the type species could secure the continued use of the name *Stentor* in its accustomed sense, but that there are substantial reasons which would render the selection of this species as the type species open to strong objection. In the first place, it must be noted that the name *Stentor solitarius* Oken was not based upon a description by Oken of a new species, but was published as a *nom. nov. pro* the species referred to by Müller (O.F.) (1773) as *Vorticella stentorea*. Next, we have to note that Müller never published this name as a new name ; what he did was to place in the genus *Vorticella* the species which Linnaeus in 1758 had named *Hydra stentoria* (a name which in 1767 Linnaeus himself emended to *stentorea*). Thus, the identity of Oken's *Stentor solitarius* turns entirely upon the identity of the species *Hydra stentoria* Linnaeus. Professor Kirby examined the taxonomic questions involved and reached the conclusion that, prior to Ehrenberg's work, and, in particular, his *Die Infusionsthierchen* of 1838, it is impossible to identify with certainty to what species should be applied to names published for colourless stentorids. It was to overcome these difficulties that (as explained in Professor Kirby's paper) I suggested (*in litt.*) that the best course would be for the Commission to use its Plenary Powers to secure that Ehrenberg's figure for *Stentor mülleri* Ehrenberg, 1832, should be taken to define the nominal species, to be designated as the type species of *Stentor* Oken. The advantage of this course lies in the fact that Ehrenberg's name *Stentor mülleri* is a substitute name for Müller's *Vorticella stentoria*, which (as already explained) is objectively identical with Oken's *Stentor solitarius*. This suggestion commended itself to Professor Kirby and is included in the proposal submitted at the close of the present Report. It is naturally an essential part of that plan that the specific name *mülleri* Ehrenberg should be preserved for the species to which it is always applied. Accordingly it is proposed not only that the specific name *stentoria* Linnaeus, 1758 (and its emendation *stentorea* Linnaeus, 1767), both being specific names for species which cannot be certainly identified, should be suppressed under the Plenary Powers, but also that the specific name *solitarius* Oken should be suppressed for similar reasons. The suppression of *nomina dubia*, when their clarification might give rise to confusion, is clearly the best means of promoting stability in nomenclature and of avoiding confusion. If these names are disposed of in this way, it will be necessary to designate some other nominal species to be the type species of the genus *Stentor* Oken. Clearly, the most appropriate choice would be the nominal species *Stentor mülleri* Ehrenberg, 1832, as defined by the description and figures published by that author in 1838.

7. The settlement of the *Stentor* problem on the foregoing lines would provide valid force for the current use of that name, without causing the slightest inconvenience or difficulty in any other field. I accordingly recommend the foregoing solution to the favourable consideration of the Commission. The detailed action recommended is that the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should :—

(1) use its Plenary Powers :—

  (a) to suppress for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not of the Law of Homonymy the under-mentioned generic names :–

    (i) *Eclissa* Modeer, 1790 ;

    (ii) *Ecclissa* Schrank, 1802 ;

    (iii) *Linza* Schrank, 1802 ;

  (b) to suppress for the purposes both of the Law of Priority and of the Law of Homonymy the generic name *Stentor* St. Hilaire, 1812 :

  (c) to validate the generic name *Stentor* Oken, 1815 (in the event of Oken's *Lehrbuch der Naturgeschichte* being declared unavailable for nomenclatorial purposes) ;

  (d) to suppress the under-mentioned specific names for the purposes of the Law of Priority :—

    (i) *stentoria* Linnaeus, 1758 (as published in the binominal combination *Hydra stentoria*) ;

    (ii) *stentorea* (emend. of *stentoria*) Linnaeus, 1767 (as published in the binominal combination *Hydra stentorea*) ;

    (iii) *solitarius* Oken, 1815 (as published in the binominal combination *Stentor solitarius*) ;

  (e) to direct that the name *Stentor mülleri* Ehrenberg, 1832, is to be interpreted by reference to the description and figures published therefor by Ehrenberg in 1838 (*Die Infusionsth.* : 262) ;

  (f) to designate *Stentor mülleri* Ehrenberg, 1832, as defined in (e) above, to be the type species of *Stentor* Oken, 1815 ;

(2) to place the name *Stentor* Oken, 1815 (type species, by designation under the Plenary Powers under (1) (f) above: *Stentor muelleri* Ehrenberg, 1832, as defined under the Plenary Powers under (e) above) on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*;

(3) to place on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology*:—

  (a) the four generic names proposed under (1) (a) above to be suppressed under the Plenary Powers;

  (b) the name *Stentor* St. Hilaire, 1812, proposed under (1) (b) above to be suppressed under the Plenary Powers;

  (c) the under-mentioned generic names which are junior objective synonyms of *Stentor* Oken, 1815:-

    (i) *Tubaria* Thienemann, 1828;

    (ii) *Stentorella* Reichenbach, 1828;

(4) to place the specific name *muelleri* Ehrenberg, 1832, as published in the binominal combination *Stentor muelleri*, as defined under the Plenary Powers under (1) (e) above, on the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology*;

(5) to place on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* the three specific names specified in (1) (d) above, as there proposed to be suppressed under the Plenary Powers.

REQUEST FOR A RULING ON THE QUESTION OF THE TYPE SPECIES OF "ANCILLA" LAMARCK, 1799 (CLASS GASTROPODA)

By KATHERINE V. W. PALMER

(*Paleontological Research Institution, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)170)

Ancilla was proposed by Lamarck, 1799, *Mém. Soc. Hist. nat. Paris* **1** : 70. Following the description of the genus is "Volute . . . Martini conch. 2, p. 359, t. 65, f. 722-724."

The species is not cited by name by Lamarck, but it had been named by Gmelin, 1792, *in* Linnaeus, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 13) **6** : 3467. *Voluta* ampla . . . Volute . . . Martini 2, t. 65, fig. 722-724 (the same reference as that of Lamarck). The species is still regarded as valid.

Does not the type species of *Ancilla* Lamarck, 1799 then become *Voluta ampla* Gmelin, 1792, by monotypy ?

ON THE TYPE SPECIES OF "ANCILLA" LAMARCK, 1799 (CLASS GASTROPODA), A GENUS ESTABLISHED WITH NO CITED NOMINAL SPECIES

By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)170)

When in 1937 Mrs. Katherine Palmer submitted her application to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for a ruling on the question of the type species of the genus *Ancilla* Lamarck, 1799, there existed no express provision in the *Règles* on the procedure to be followed in determining the type species of a genus, to which species had been referred by the original author of the generic name but none of those species had on that occasion been cited under a binominal name. The only guide then available was the feeble and uncertain light thrown by the Ruling given in *Opinion* 46 (1912, *Smithson. Publ.* **2060** : 104-107).

2. At Paris in 1948 the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, on the recommendation of the International Commission, substituted for the ambiguous provisions of *Opinion* 46 a provision under which, in the case of a nominal genus established without any nominal species as being referable thereto, the nominal species first assigned to the genus by a subsequent author is, or are, to be treated as the sole species originally included in the genus ; where only one such species is cited by the first subsequent author that species is the type species by monotypy ; where two or more such species are so cited, the type species of the genus is whichever of those species is first so selected by a subsequent author acting under Rule (g) in Article 30 (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 159-160, 346). It is in the light of this provision therefore that it is necessary to examine the problem submitted by Mrs. Palmer.

3. Following the publication of the Paris decision referred to above, I applied (18th March 1951) to Dr. L. R. Cox (*British Museum* (*Natural History*), *London*) for information on the question of what was the first nominal species to be assigned to the genus *Ancilla* Lamarck. Dr. Cox replied on the following day as follows :—

> This question seems easily settled. The first nominal species assigned to *Ancilla* was *Ancilla cinnamomea* Lamarck, 1801 (*Syst. Anim. sans Vertèbr.* : 73), founded on Martini, *Conch.* 2, t. 65, fig. 731. This is therefore the type species by monotypy. It is a Recent Indo-Pacific species belonging to the same group as *Voluta ampla* Gmelin, so that the change in type-species has no effect on nomenclature.

4. When as in the present case the Congress clarifies a hitherto obscure provision in the *Règles*, there is always a danger that in individual cases the application of the revised provision will lead to a disturbance of existing nomenclatorial practice sufficiently serious to call for remedial action under the Plenary Powers. In the present case however it appears from the information furnished by Dr. Cox that, although the application of the Paris provision will lead to a change in the type species of the genus *Ancilla* Lamarck, the species (*Ancilla cinnamomea* Lamarck) which becomes the type species under the foregoing provision is considered by specialists to be congeneric with the species (*Voluta ampla* Gmelin, 1792) referred to, but not cited by name, by Lamarck when he established the nominal genus *Ancilla*. On the available evidence, therefore, there does not appear to be any ground for anticipating difficulties arising from the application of the Paris provision in this case.

5. In the circumstances, it appears that the action called for in answer to the question raised by Mrs. Palmer is a ruling by the Commission : (1) stating that under the *Règles*, as revised by the Paris Congress, *Ancilla cinnamomea* Lamarck, 1801, is the type species of *Ancilla* Lamarck, 1799, by monotypy ; (2) placing the generic name *Ancilla* Lamarck, 1799, with the above species as type species, on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* ; (3) placing the specific name *cinnamomea* Lamarck, 1801, as published in the combination *Ancilla cinnamomea*, on the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology*.

PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO VALIDATE THE GENERIC NAME "MELANARGIA" MEIGEN, 1828, BY SUPPRESSING THE NAME "AGAPETES" BILLBERG, 1820 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER LEPIDOPTERA)

By JIŘÍ PACLT
(*Bratislava, Czechoslovakia*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)708)

The purpose of the present application is to ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to use its Plenary Powers for the purpose of suppressing the name *Agapetes* Billberg, 1820, thereby validating the well-known name *Melanargia* Meigen, 1828, for the Palaearctic genus of SATYRIDAE which has borne this name continuously ever since its publication 125 years ago. The facts of this case are set out below.

2. The first name given to this genus was *Arge* Hübner, [1819] (*Verz. bek. Schmett.* (4) : 60), but this name was invalid, being a junior homonym of *Arge* Schrank, 1802 (*Faun. boica* **2** (2) : 209).

3. A year later the name *Agapetes* Billberg, 1820 (*Enum. Ins.* : 78) was published in a catalogue of the butterflies contained in Billberg's collection ; no generic diagnosis was given, the only indication given by Billberg as to how he interpreted this genus being the citation of the names of two species now recognised as being congeneric and both placed by current authors in the genus *Melanargia* Meigen, 1828 (see paragraph 4 below). The two species so cited were : *Papilio galathea* Linnaeus, 1758 (*Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 474) ; *Papilio lachesis* Hübner, 1790 (*Beitr. Schmett.* **2** (3): 70, pl. 3, figs. P.1, 2♂). Of these species the former was selected as the type species of this genus by Scudder in 1875 (*Proc. Amer. Acad. Arts Sci.*, Boston **10** : 104).

4. The name which the present application is concerned to save, *Melanargia* Meigen was published in 1828 (*Syst. Beschr. europ. Schmett.* **1** (3) : 97), where it was applied to *Papilio galathea* Linnaeus, 1758, and to a number of its European allies. Meigen did not designate a type species for this genus, but Kirby in 1894 (*in* Allen's *Nat. Libr.*, Handbook Lepidoptera **1** Butt. **1** : 240) selected *Papilio galathea* Linnaeus to be its type species.

5. With the exception of a few authors who at one time erroneously applied the name *Satyrus* Latreille, 1810 (now placed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* with *Papilio actaea* Esper, [1780], as type species) to this genus, all subsequent workers have, with a few very recent exceptions, called this genus by the name *Melanargia* Meigen. Further, up to 1948 they were perfectly correct in so doing, for it was not until that year that the International Congress of Zoology amended the definition of the expression "indication" as used in Proviso (*a*) to Article 25 of the *Règles* in such a way as to accord availability to the names of genera established without any verbal diagnosis and distinguished only by the citation thereunder of the names of previously established nominal species (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 78-80). As the purpose of this change was to promote stability and uniformity in nomenclature by validating such of the names belonging to this class as were in general use, it must certainly be concluded conversely that it was intended also to give

PURCHASED

relief in any case such as the present where the grant of this concession would have an exactly opposite result, that is, where it would itself directly contribute to instability and confusion. The present application is accordingly submitted as falling directly within the intention of the arrangements contemplated at the time when Article 25 of the *Règles* was modified in the manner described above.

6. The action which the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is now asked to take is that it should :—

(1) use its Plenary Powers to suppress the name *Agapetes* Billberg, 1820, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy ;

(2) place the generic name *Melanargia* Meigen, 1828 (gender of generic name : feminine) (type species, by selection by Kirby (1894) : *Papilio galathea* Linnaeus, 1758) on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* :

(3) place the under-mentioned specific names on the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* :—
  (*a*) *galathea* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Papilio galathea* (specific name of type species of *Melanargia* Meigen, 1828) ;
  (*b*) *lachesis* Hübner, 1790, as published in the combination *Papilio lachesis* ;

(4) place the under-mentioned generic names on the *Official List of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* :—
  (*a*) *Arge* Hübner, [1819] (invalid junior homonym of *Arge* Schrank, 1802) ;
  (*b*) *Agapetes* Billberg, 1820, as proposed, under (1) above, to be suppressed under the Plenary Powers.

SUPPORT FOR DR. J. PACLT'S PROPOSAL FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF THE GENERIC NAME "AGAPETES" BILLBERG, 1820 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER LEPIDOPTERA)

By N. D. RILEY
(*British Museum* (*Natural History*), *London*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)708)

(Letter dated 7th November 1952)

I am interested to learn that Dr. Paclt has suggested to the Commission that they should use their Plenary Powers to suppress the generic name *Agapetes* Billberg. As a lepidopterist, I am entirely in favour of this. This name has crept into the literature in a somewhat furtive way during the last quarter of a century, and its suppression would formally re-establish the much better known generic name *Melanargia*. All students of the Palaearctic Rhopalocera will, I am sure, be everlastingly grateful. The case seems to be a perfectly straightforward one in which only by the use of the Plenary Powers can a clear-cut decision be reached.

CONTENTS OF THE PRESENT PART

(*continued from front wrapper*)

Page

Report on the status of new names published in Oken [1815-1816], *Lehrbuch der Naturgeschichte*. By Francis Hemming, *Secretary to the International Commission* 193

Appendix 1. By the late Dr. Wilfred H. Osgood (*Chicago Natural History Museum, Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.*) 202

Appendix 2. By Karl Jordan (*British Museum* (*Natural History*), *Zoological Museum, Tring, Herts.*).. 204

Appendix 3. By Angel Cabrera (*Eva Peron, F.C.N.G.R., Argentina*) 206

Appendix 4. By T. C. S. Morrison-Scott (*British Museum* (*Natural History*), *London*) 207

On the need for validating the name *Stentor* Oken, 1815 (Class Ciliophora) for use in its accustomed sense. By Harold Kirby (*University of California, Berkeley, California, U.S.A.*) 208

Report on the status of the generic name *Stentor* Oken, 1815 (Class Ciliophora, Sub-Class Ciliata). By Francis Hemming, *Secretary to the International Commission* 214

Request for a Ruling on the question of the type species of *Ancilla* Lamarck, 1799 (Class Gastropoda). By Katherine V. W. Palmer (*Paleontological Research Institution, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*) .. 219

On the type species of *Ancilla* Lamarck, 1799 (Class Gastropoda), a genus established with no cited nominal species. By Francis Hemming, *Secretary to the International Commission* 219

Proposed use of the Plenary Powers to validate the generic name *Melanargia* Meigen, 1828 (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera), by suppressing the name *Agapetes* Billberg, 1820. By Jiří Paclt (*Bratislava, Czechoslovakia*) 221

Support for Dr. J. Paclt's proposal for the suppression of the generic name *Agapetes* Billberg, 1820 (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera). By N. D. Riley (*British Museum* (*Natural History*), *London*) .. 222

Printed by Metchim & Son Limited, 8 Storey's Gate, London, S.W.1.

VOLUME 9. Part 8
pp. 223-254

11*th May* 1954

17 MAY 1954
PURCHASED

THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

The Official Organ of

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Edited by

FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

CONTENTS :

Notices prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology :

Page

Date of commencement by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of voting on applications published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* 223

Notice of the possible use by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of its Plenary Powers in certain cases 224

(*continued on back wrapper*)

LONDON :

Printed by Order of the International Trust for
Zoological Nomenclature
and
Sold on behalf of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
by the International Trust
at its Publications Office,
41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.
1954

Price Twelve Shillings and Sixpence

(*All rights reserved*)

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

A. The Officers of the Commission

Honorary Life President : Dr. Karl Jordan (*British Museum (Natural History), Zoological Museum, Tring, Herts., England*)

President : Professor James Chester Bradley (*Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*) (12th August 1953)

Vice-President : Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (*Sao Paulo, Brazil*) (12th August 1953)

Secretary : Mr. Francis Hemming (*London, England*) (27th July 1948)

B. The Members of the Commission

(*Arranged in order of precedence by reference to date of election or of most recent re-election, as prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology*)

Professor H. Boschma (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The Netherlands*) (1st January 1947)
Senor Dr. Angel Cabrera (*Eva Peron, F.C.N.G.R., Argentina*) (27th July 1948)
Mr. Francis Hemming (*London, England*) (27th July 1948) (*Secretary*)
Dr. Joseph Pearson (*Tasmanian Museum, Hobart, Tasmania, Australia*) (27th July 1948)
Dr. Henning Lemche (*Universitetets Zoologiske Museum, Copenhagen, Denmark*) (27th July 1948)
Professor Teiso Esaki (*Kyushu University, Fukuoka, Japan*) (17th April 1950)
Professor Pierre Bonnet (*Université de Toulouse, France*) (9th June 1950)
Mr. Norman Denbigh Riley (*British Museum (Natural History) London*) (9th June 1950)
Professor Tadeusz Jaczewski (*Institute of Zoology, Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw, Poland*) (15th June 1950)
Professor Robert Mertens (*Natur-Museum u. Forschungs-Institut Senckenberg, Frankfurt a. M., Germany*) (5th July 1950)
Professor Erich Martin Hering (*Zoologisches Museum der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Germany*) (5th July 1950)
Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (*S. Paulo, Brazil*) (12th August 1953) (*Vice-President*)
Professor J. R. Dymond (*University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada*) (12th August 1953)
Professor J. Chester Bradley (*Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*) (12th August 1953) (*President*)
Professor Harold E. Vokes (*Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, U.S.A.*) (12th August 1953)
Professor Béla Hankó (*Békéscsaba, Hungary*) (12th August 1953)
Dr. Norman R. Stoll (*Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, New York, N.Y., U.S.A.*) (12th August 1953)
Mr. P. C. Sylvester-Bradley (*Sheffield University, Sheffield, England*) (12th August 1953)
Dr. L. B. Holthuis (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The Netherlands*) (12th August 1953)

BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Volume 9, Part 8 (pp. 223-254) 11th May 1954

NOTICES PRESCRIBED BY THE INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ZOOLOGY

The following notices are given in pursuance of decisions taken, on the recommendation of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 51–56, 57–59), by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, July 1948 (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **5** : 5–13, 131).

(a) Date of commencement by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of voting on applications published in the " Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature "

Notice is hereby given that normally the International Commission may start to vote upon applications published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* on the expiry of a period of six calendar months from the date of publication in the *Bulletin* of the applications in question. Any specialist who may desire to comment upon any of the applications published in the present Part (Vol. 9, Part 8) of the *Bulletin* is accordingly invited to do so in writing to the Secretary to the Commission, as quickly as possible and in any case, in sufficient time to enable the communication in question to reach the Secretariat of the Commission before the expiry of the six-month period referred to above.

Notices prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology (*continued*)

(b) Notice of the possible use by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of its plenary powers in certain cases

1. Notice is hereby given that the possible use by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of its Plenary Powers, is involved in applications published in the present Part of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* in relation to the following names :—

(1) Geoffroy, 1762, *Histoire abrégée des insectes qui se trouvent aux environs de Paris*, proposed validation of the following six names published in, for genera of the Order Diptera: *Stratiomys*, *Stomoxys*, *Volucella*, *Nemotelus*, *Scatopse*, *Bibio* (Z.N.(S.)710) ;

(2) *Palmatotriton* Smith, 1945 (Cl. Amphibia), proposed suppression of (Z.N.(S.)594) ;

(3) *Ammonites mammillatus* Schlotheim, 1813, proposed designation of a neotype for, and *Douvilleiceras* de Grossouvre, 1893 (Cl. Cephalopoda, Order Ammonoidea), proposed designation of a type species for (Z.N.(S.)631).

2. Comments received in sufficient time will be published in the *Bulletin* : other comments, provided that they are received within the prescribed period of six calendar months from the date of publication of the present Part will be laid before the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at the time of commencement of voting on the application concerned.

3. In accordance with the arrangement agreed upon at the Session held by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in Paris in 1948 (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 56) corresponding Notices have been sent to the serial publications *Nature* and *Science*.

FRANCIS HEMMING,

Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

28 Park Village East, Regent's Park,
London, N.W.1, England.

11th May 1954

RESULTS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE PROPOSED SUPPRESSION, UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS, OF THE GENERIC NAMES IN THE ORDER DIPTERA (CLASS INSECTA) BY MEIGEN PUBLISHED IN 1800 IN THE " NOUVELLE CLASSIFICATION DES MOUCHES A DEUX AILES "

By CURTIS W. SABROSKY
(*United States Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)191)

(Enclosure to letter dated 9th October 1952)

Following the publication on 15th April 1952 (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **6** : 131–141) of my paper entitled " Meigen, 1800 : A proposal for stability and uniformity," I distributed separates of that paper to 370 publishing dipterists throughout the world, together with a Questionnaire (annexed to the present paper as Appendix 1) designed to elicit their views on the action which it was desirable should be taken on the Meigen problem and a covering " statement " (annexed to the present paper as Appendix 2). The above documents were mailed in May 1952.

At the time of this summary (October 9th 1952), replies had been received from 188 or 51 per cent. In order to show in a general way the distribution of the questionnaires and replies, seven divisions were adopted, as indicated in Table 1 and succeeding tables.

The answers to questions one to five are summarised below in Tables 2 and 3. For all questions there were some blanks, and a few replies that could not readily be entered in the summaries. These non-classifiable answers, scattered throughout the geographical divisions, totalled 17 on the first question, 25 on the second, 24 on the third, 5 on the fourth, and 18 on the fifth. Question 6 is a general question which is not directly pertinent to the application and has been summarised separately.

The summary is of course based only on those who replied specifically to the questionnaire, either by its return or by a letter relating to it. Of those who did not reply, some are known to use and favour the 1803 names and some the 1800 names. For many others, their present usage or preference is unknown to me. One can only assume that the reactions in the half that did not reply do not differ materially from those in the half that did.

Table 1. Distribution of Questionnaires and Replies

Country or Region	Number Sent	Number of Replies	Per Cent. Replies
United States* and Canada ..	112	71	63
Latin America†	49	19	39
Great Britain	41	24	59
Continental Europe‡	95	42	44
Africa	25	12	48
Asia §	30	10	33
Australasia	18	10	56
Totals	370	188	51

* Including Hawaii, Puerto Rico, Panama Canal Zone. Fifteen were sent to Canada, with nine replies ; balance to United States and its possessions.

† Questionnaires to 12 countries, the largest numbers to Brazil (26), Argentine (5) and Venezuela (5).

‡ Questionnaires to 17 countries, with greatest numbers to Germany (18), France (12), Netherlands and Belgium (21), and Scandinavia (15). Replies from 12 countries, with greatest numbers from Germany (14), Netherlands and Belgium (8), and Scandinavia (5).

§ Including the Philippines.

Table 2. Summary of Replies to Questions 1 to 5 in Questionnaire (Appendix 2)

Source	Question 1			Question 2			Question 3			
			Per Cent.			Per Cent.	No Change		Change	
	Yes	No	Yes	1803	1800	1803	1803	1800	1803 to 1800	1800 to 1803
United States and Canada ..	51	17	75	36	25	59	36	4	22	1
Latin America	13	2	87	16	3	84	16	3	—	—
Great Britain	20	1	95	21	—	100	20	—	—	2
Continental Europe	36	3	92	20	18	53	17	11	7	3
Africa	9	2	82	9	1	90	7	—	1	2
Asia	3	5	37	3	2	60	2	—	2	1
Australasia	7	2	78	9	—	100	9	—	—	—
Totals	139	32	80	114	49	70	107	18	32	9

Table 2 (Continued)

Source	Question 4			Question 5			
			Per Cent.	Yes on Question 4		No on Question 4	
	Yes	No	Yes	Would Change	Would Not	Would Change	Would Not
United States and Canada ..	60	10	86	47	10	9	1
Latin America	17	2	89	10	2	2	—
Great Britain	24	—	100	14	6	—	—
Continental Europe	26	13	67	18	8	10	3
Africa	11	1	92	9	1	1	—
Asia	7	2	78	6	—	2	—
Australasia	10	—	100	9	1	—	—
Totals	155	28	85	113	28	24	4

SUMMARY OF COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE QUESTIONS

Question 1 : Four-fifths (80 per cent.) of the 171 who replied to this question indicated that their special fields of research involve the disputed Meigen 1800 names, and they may therefore be presumed to be familiar with and concerned with the controversy. Still others are also directly involved, of course, because they use the names in teaching or in identification services, as was brought out in questions 2(*b*) and 2(*c*).

Question 2 : Of the total of 163 replies to this question, 114 or 70 per cent. stated that they now use the 1803 names, and 49 or 30 per cent. the 1800 names. It is interesting to note that in the two largest divisions, the United States and Canada (61 replies) and Continental Europe (38 replies), the per cent. of authors using 1803 names is a little over half (59 and 53 per cent., respectively). On the other hand, the combined figures for the rest of the world show 64 replies to this question, with 58 or 91 per cent. indicating 1803 usage.

Question 3 : Of the 166 replies, 125 showed no change in usage (107 with 1803 usage, 18 with 1800 usage). Thirty-two authors (22 of them in the United States and Canada) indicated that they had changed from 1803 to 1800, all of those in the United States and Canada changing after 1937 and nine of these after 1945. However, it should be noted that one of the nine changed back to 1803 names after one year, and another used 1800 names in one paper in 1952 through editorial policy rather than personal preference. Nine authors had changed from 1800 to 1803, at least six of these changing since 1945.

Question 4 : This key question, on approval or disapproval of the application to suppress the 1800 paper, elicited 183 replies. 155 (85 per cent.) supported the proposal, and 28 (15 per cent.) opposed it.

It may be of interest to compare the replies with those to the second question, as follows :

Table 3. Comparison of Replies received to Question 2 and Question 4 respectively

Source	Question 2			Question 4		
	1803	1800	Per cent. 1803	Yes	No	Per cent. Yes
United States and Canada	36	25	59	60	10	86
Continental Europe ..	20	18	53	26	13	67
The rest of the world ..	58	6	91	69	5	93
Totals ..	114	49	70	155	28	85

Thus, in the two geographical divisions in which 1803 and 1800 usages are closest, 59 per cent. and 53 per cent. of the workers currently are using the 1803 names, but 86 per cent. and 67 per cent., respectively, support the proposal to suppress the 1800 paper. This willingness on the part of a number of workers to vote against their own current usage may reflect a desire to settle the question in the direction of the predominant usage (as reported in my application), a willingness to go along with the majority, or a willingness to change because their own change to 1800 usage was so recent that no great amount of literature has resulted and no confirmed habit has been fixed. In the rest of the world, with 91 per cent. 1803 usage, the proposal is supported by 93 per cent. of the replies.

Question 5 : There were 169 replies to this question, 141 by those who answered Question 4 in the affirmative and 28 by those who answered it in the negative. Of the 141 affirmative votes on the proposal, 113 or 80 per cent. would nevertheless agree to adopt the 1800 names if the Commission decided in their favour. Twenty-eight (20 per cent.) said they would not change. Of the 28 negative votes on the proposal, 24 (86 per cent.) would change to the 1803 names if the Commission decided in their favour, while 4 (14 per cent.) would not change. Thus on each side the percentage of those who would not change is not greatly different.

It is indeed unfortunate that some workers decline to follow the Commission and majority opinion, whichever way these might go, for it means that we shall continue to have a certain amount of annoying and senseless confusion. Percentagewise, both sides are about the same ; numerically, those who oppose the proposal and would refuse to change are fewer in number (4). In a practical sense, therefore, suppression of the 1800 paper would result in less confusion in the sense of leaving fewer authors as exceptions to the majority practice. On the other hand, a number of the " 1803 " supporters who will not change are old or retired, and perhaps refusal to change should not be given too much weight in considering the best step for the future.

AUTHORS' COMMENTS

Most authors replied to the questionnaire without comment. Among those who did comment, there were a number of enthusiastic expressions of approbation, of pleasure at a prospect of resolving the confusion, and of hope that the conflicting usage in Diptera could be ended, one way or the other. There were also several comments in some detail from supporters of the 1800 names who opposed the application, and almost all of these are thoughtful, considered statements of general principle which can be commended, and which should be given their due consideration by the International Commission, even though they represent a minority vote in this survey.

Appendices

The names and addresses of all the dipterists who, in replying to the Questionnaire, stated (*a*) that they were in favor of the proposed suppression of the " Meigen 1800 " names and (*b*) that they were opposed to the foregoing proposal are given in Appendix 3 in Lists A and B respectively. In the same Appendix there is given in List C particulars of those authors who, in reply to Question 3 of the Questionnaire, stated that at one time or another they had changed their usage as between the " 1800 " and " 1803 " names respectively. In Appendix 4 a summary is given of the reactions of dipterists to changing family names *only* when type genera are found to be homonyms (Question 6).

APPENDIX 1

Text of Questionnaire issued in May 1952

QUESTIONNAIRE ON MEIGEN 1800

May 1952

The enclosed proposal is at once a comment on several individual cases already published (*Bull. zool. Nomen.*) and an all-inclusive counter-proposal. You are earnestly requested and urged to answer the questions below and to send this page as soon as possible to Mr. Curtis W. Sabrosky, Bureau of Entomology & Plant Quarantine, U.S. Dept. of Agriculture, Washington 25, D.C., who has undertaken, at the request of Secretary Hemming, to assemble and tabulate the replies for the Commission. It is assumed that your name may be listed in the summary. Any comments you wish to make may also be quoted unless you request otherwise. If any dipterists do not receive this material, through unfortunate oversight or unknown address, copies may be had from Mr. Sabrosky.

1. Do your special fields of research involve disputed Meigen 1800 names (including the family names affected) ?............(Yes or No.) (Note: If your answer is No, you may still be interested in later questions.)

2. Which do you now use, the 1800 or the 1803 names ?

(*a*) In publishing..........(1800 or 1803 ?) (Answer any or all questions as appropriate.)
(*b*) In teaching............(1800 or 1803 ?)
(*c*) In identification or other services............(1800 or 1803 ?)

3. If you have changed usage during your professional career, which way did you change and when............(1800 to 1803) / (1803 to 1800) in............

4. Do you vote for the present proposal to suppress the Meigen 1800 paper ? ....(Yes or No).

5. (*a*) If your answer to 4 is No, would you nevertheless change to the 1803 names, if the Commission should decide in their favour because of preponderant literature, and if a significant majority of dipterists favour them ? ....(Yes or No).

(*b*) If your answer to 4 is Yes, would you nevertheless agree to adopt the 1800 names if the Commission should decide in their favour after considering the principles, the evidence, and the results of this questionnaire ?............ (Yes or No).

6. A general question, whose solution would remove one objection to 1800 names, especially among teachers : Would you favour a general rule to require changing a family name *only* when the type genus is found to be a homonym, and not when it becomes a synonym ?............(Yes or No). (Example : *Larvaevora* 1800 could be accepted, with *Tachina* 1803 in synonymy, but the family name Tachinidae would not need to be changed.)

....
Signature.

APPENDIX 2

Statement distributed with the Questionnaire reproduced in Appendix 1

I have been concerned for many years with the conflicting usage of the Meigen names in Diptera, the nuisance of explaining it to students, non-dipterists, economic entomologists, and zoologists, and the sterility and futility of the seemingly endless discussions about it. As far as the names themselves are concerned (and I have used both sets of names at various periods of my work), I am not a protagonist for either 1800 or 1803 names; rather, and above all, I wish the dispute settled once and for all, and be done with it. Whatever the solution may be, let us adopt it. If 1800, then let all change to those names promptly and completely, and achieve respectable stability and uniformity in the eyes of fellow entomologists and zoologists and biologists. If 1803, let us equally manfully change to those names to the same admirable ends. In other words, let us dipterists put our house in order!

Some may complain that the Commission has already passed upon a similar application, after a questionnaire conducted in 1932 by F. W. Edwards. However, that questionnaire showed that of the eighty-eight dipterists who replied to it ("including a very high percentage of the working dipterists of the world"), 87 per cent. were opposed to the 1800 names, but despite that fact the *ad hoc* committee of the Entomological Congress at Paris (1932) voted four to two (exactly in line with the way the individual members of the committee voted on the questionnaire!) in favour of a contrary resolution that "This section is of the opinion that more confusion would result by now rejecting the generic names" of Meigen 1800 "than by retaining them," and they therefore recommended their definite adoption. This resolution was later confirmed by the Congress. At Madrid in 1935, on a crowded agenda, the matter was passed on to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature. The latter had presented to it, in effect, a proposal that the 1800 names be adopted, coming from the Entomological Congress, to whose recommendations the I.C.Z.N. customarily gives great weight.

This history shows clearly the danger of a local or prejudiced majority—a danger that is inherent in all actions taken by International Congresses, for in 1932 the resolution of the Paris Congress could not have been supported by any evidence. It flatly contradicted the survey made by Edwards among working dipterists, and at that date, twenty years ago, it had no basis in usage in the literature. Kertesz and Coquillett, two early supporters of the 1800 names, had died too soon after 1908 to leave much literature or to influence many workers; others such as Kieffer and Townsend had changed back from 1800 to 1803 names; Lindner's great series was less than a decade old, having begun in 1923; the "Faune de France" series had begun in 1924, but up to 1932, of the seven volumes that involved the disputed names, six used the 1803 names; the extensive American literature was overwhelmingly 1803, for Coquillett had died in 1910, E. P. Felt's activity was limited to one family, and J. M. Aldrich, a staunch 1803 advocate, dominated the American scene; and finally, the total amount of 1800 usage, measured against the backdrop of all literature from 1803 to 1908, and the bulk of that from 1908 to 1932 was insignificant.

One important point made by 1800 advocates is that to make this exception would weaken further the Law of Priority and would lower the bars for more and more exceptions. This argument is very appealing. However, the history of the International Commission shows so many exceptions already that it is difficult to see how this one case by itself can be regarded as "lowering the bars." Furthermore, it is not my intention, and I hope that the case will not be so used by others, to use it as a precedent for making further exceptions in individual cases. Rather, because the Meigen 1800 paper is so far-reaching and important, and has been such a *bête noire* in Diptera, I believe that it should be considered as a case by itself, completely without prejudice to individual situations which are so often of such minor importance or limited application that the Law of Priority should be used without hesitation. If my application is used as a precedent in any way, it should be this: Any application should furnish full documentation and evidence of consequence, and not merely echo the cliché that greater confusion than uniformity would result if a certain decision were not made.

I can also report the results of a survey of recent usage in papers reported in the latest volume (1951) of the Bibliography of Agriculture. This adds one year to the survey reported in Table 2 of my paper. Of ninety-one taxonomic publications, 62 per cent. used 1803 names; of thirty-nine non-taxonomic, 82 per cent. used 1803: the totals: 130 papers, 68 per cent. with 1803 names. Of the ninety-seven authors of these 1930 papers, 72 per cent. used 1803 names. In each column, this represents a decrease from 1950, though in some cases slight. There are several points here: It was a year of considerable activity by such 1800 authors as D. E. Hardy and W. W. Wirth, and of little activity by such 1803 authors as C. P. Alexander and H. Oldroyd; the percentage of taxonomic papers has fluctuated since 1939 (Table 2), probably reflecting the relative activity of various authors; the percentage of authors using 1803 names shows a steady decline since 1939, though the difference between 1939 and 1952 is still slight. One might argue interminably about significance and trends and time element; the fact remains that the percentages of 1803 usage are still high. Furthermore, these refer largely to current periodical literature, and one must still consider the high proportion of 1803 usage represented in the major works (Table 1).

Reprints of the enclosed application were furnished through the courtesy of Secretary Hemming and the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature, in order to make the circularisation of interested persons as complete and far-reaching as possible.

Curtis W. Sabrosky

APPENDIX 3

Names and addresses of dipterists replying to the Questionnaire

A. REPLIES IN FAVOUR OF THE PROPOSAL THAT THE MEIGEN "1800" NAMES SHOULD BE SUPPRESSED

United States and Canada

Alexander, C. P., U. of Mass., Amherst, Mass.
Arnaud, Paul H., Jr., 60 Woodrow St., Redwood City, Calif.
Belkin, J. N., U. of California, Los Angeles, Calif.
Bellamy, R. E., U.S. Public Health Service, Bakersfield, Calif.
Bequaert, J., Harvard Univ., Cambridge, Mass.
Blanton, F. S., Ft. Clayton, Panama Canal Zone
Bohart, Geo. E., U.S. Bureau Ent. & Plant Quar., Logan, Utah
Bohart, R. M., Univ. of California, Davis, Calif.
Breland, O. P., Univ. of Texas, Austin, Texas
Brookman, Bernard, U.S. Public Health Service, Bakersfield, Calif.
Brooks, A. R., Dominion Ent. Lab., Saskatoon, Sask., Canada
Brues, C. T., Harvard Univ., Cambridge, Mass. (retired)
Camras, Sidney, 4407 N. Milwaukee Ave., Chicago, Ill.
Coher, E. I., Univ. of Massachusetts, Amherst, Mass.
Cole, Frank R., P.O. Box 6, Redlands, Calif.
Curran, C. H., American Museum of Natural History, New York, N.Y.
Dalmat, H. T., U.S. Public Health Service, Guatemala City, Guatemala
Davies, D. M., McMaster Univ., Hamilton, Ont., Canada
Dodge, H. R., U.S. Public Health Service, Chamblee, Georgia
Fairchild, G. B., Gorgas Memorial Lab., Ancon, Panama Canal Zone
Ferris, G. F., Stanford Univ., Stanford, Calif.
Fluke, C. L., Univ. of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.
Freeborn, S. B., Univ. of California, Berkeley, Calif.
Frick, K. E., Irrigation Experiment Station, Prosser, Wash.
Hall, D. G., U.S. Bureau of Ent. & Plant Quar., Washington. D.C.
Hull, F. M., Univ. of Mississippi, University, Miss.
James, M. T., Washington State College, Pullman, Wash.
Johannsen, O. A., Cornell Univ. (retired), Ithaca, N.Y.
King, W. V., U.S. Bureau of Ent. & Plant Quar., Orlando, Fla.
Komp, W. H. W., U.S. Public Health Service, Bethesda, Md.
Laffoon, J. L., Iowa State College, Ames, Iowa
Malloch, J. R., P.O. Box 1925, Tampa, Fla. (retired)
Martin, Charles H., Oregon State College, Corvallis, Ore.
Matheson, R., Cornell Univ., Ithaca, N.Y. (retired)
Middlekauff, W. W., Univ. of California, Berkeley, Calif.
Nicholson, H. P., 5020 Hildon Road, Chamblee, Georgia
Painter, R. H., Kansas State College, Manhattan, Kans.
Patterson, J. T., Univ. of Texas, Austin, Texas
Philip, C. B., U.S. Public Health Service, Hamilton. Mont.
Pritchard, A. E., Univ. of Calif., Berkeley, Calif.
Quate, L. M., Univ. of Nebraska, Lincoln, Nebr.
Rapp, W. F., Jr., Doane College, Crete, Nebr.
Reinhard. H. J., Texas A & M College, College Station, Texas

Roback, S. S., Academy of Natural Sciences, Philadelphia, Penn.
Rogers, J. S., Univ. of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
Rozeboom, L. E., Johns Hopkins Univ., Baltimore, Md.
Sabrosky, C. W.. U.S. Bureau of Ent. & Plant Quar., Washington, D.C.
Saunders, L. G., Univ. of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Sask., Canada
Schlinger, E. I., Univ. of California, Davis, Calif.
Shaw, F. R., Univ. of Massachusetts, Amherst, Mass.
Snyder, F. M., 5604 Woodmont Ave., Baltimore, Md.
Spencer, G. J., Univ. of British Columbia, Vancouver, B.C., Canada
Steyskal, G. C., 27253 West River Road, Grosse Isle, Mich.
Strickland, E. H., Univ. of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada
Sturtevant, A. H., California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, Calif.
Thompson, W. R.. Commonwealth Bureau of Biological Control, Ottawa, Ont., Canada
Weems, H. V., Jr., Ohio State Univ., Columbus, Ohio
Wenzel, R. L., Chicago Museum of Natural History, Chicago, Ill.
West, L. S., Northern Michigan College of Education, Marquette, Michigan
Wheeler, M. R., Univ. of Texas, Austin, Texas
Zimmerman, E. C., Sugar Planters' Assn. Experiment Station, Honolulu, Hawaii

Latin America

d'Andretta, M. A. Vulcano, Dept. de Zoologia, Sec. de Agricultura, Sao Paulo, Brazil
Anduze, Pablo J., Museo de Ciencias Naturales, Caracas, Venezuela
Barretto, M. P., Univ. de Sao Paulo, Sao Paulo, Brazil
Carrera, Messias, Dept. Zool., Sec. de Agricultura, Sao Paulo, Brazil
Correa, R. R., Univ. de Sao Paulo, Sao Paulo, Brazil
Cortés, P. Raũl, Ministerio de Agricultura, Santiago, Chile
Fernandez-Yepez, F., Division de Entomologia, Maracay, Est. Aragua, Venezuela
Fonseca, J. Pinto da, Institute Biologico, Sao Paulo, Brazil
Forattini, O. P., Univ. de Sao Paulo, Sao Paulo, Brazil
Galvao, A. L. Ayrosa, Univ. de Sao Paulo, Sao Paulo, Brazil
Lane, John, Univ. de Sao Paulo, Sao Paulo, Brazil
Lima, A. da Costa, Instituto Oswaldo Cruz, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
Martinez Palacios, A., Instituto de Salubridad y Enfermedades Tropicales, Mexico, D.F., Mexico
Senior-White, R. A., Malaria Division, Port of Spain, Trinidad
Stuardo, Carlos, Casilla 4019, Santiago, Chile
Vargas, Luis, Instituto de Salubridad y Enfermedades Tropicales, Mexico, D.F., Mexico
Wygodzinsky, Petr, Universidad Nacional de Tucuman, Tucuman, Argentina

Great Britain

Andrews, H. W., Christchurch, Hants., England
Barnes, H. F., Rothamsted Experiment Station, Harpenden, Herts., England

Buxton, P. A., London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London, England
Christophers, Sir R., The Museums, Cambridge, England
Clements, A. N., Trinity College, Cambridge Univ., Cambridge, England
Coe, R. L., British Museum (Nat. Hist.), London, England
Collin, J. E., Raylands, Newmarket, Suffolk, England
Day, C. D., Dorchester, Dorset, England
Downes, J. A., Univ. of Glasgow, Glasgow, Scotland
Emden, F. I. van, Commonwealth Institute of Entomology, London, England
Fonseca, E. C. M. d'Assis-, Henleaze, Bristol, England
Freeman, Paul, British Museum (Nat. Hist.), London, England
Grensted, L. W., Oriel College, Oxford Univ., Oxford, England
Hobby, B. M., University Museum, Oxford Univ., Oxford, England
Hopkins, G. H. E., Tring, Herts., England
Jobling, B., Wellcome Labs. of Tropical Medicine, London, England
Kettle, D. S., Univ. of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, Scotland
Laurence, B. R., Luton, Beds., England
Niblett, M., Wallington, Surrey, England
Oldroyd, H., British Museum (Nat. Hist.), London, England
Parmenter, L., Thornton Heath, Surrey, England
Richards, O. W., Imperial College of Science and Technology, London, England
Smart, John, Cambridge Univ., Cambridge, England
Thomas, H. T., King's College Hospital Medical School, London, England

Continental Europe

Benoit, P. L. G., Musée du Congo Belge, Tervuren, Belgium
Bequaert, M., Gand, Belgium
Brundin, Lars, Institute of Freshwater Research, Drottningholm, Sweden
Collart, A., Musée Royal d'Histoire Naturelle, Bruxelles, Belgium
Frey, R., Museum Zoologicum, Universitatis, Helsinki, Finland
Ghesquière, J., Insectarium International, Menton (A.M.), France
Keiser, Fred, Naturhistorisches Museum, Basle, Switzerland
Kröber, O., Hudtwalckerstrasse 22hpt, Hamburg, Germany (retired)
Kruseman, G., Jr., Zoologisch Museum, Amsterdam, Netherlands
Lengersdorf, F., 26 Combahnstrasse, Beuel-Bonn am Rhein, Germany
Martini, E., Abendrotweg 21, Hamburg, Germany (retired)
Mesnil, L. P., Commonwealth Bureau of Biological Control, 139 Seestrasse, Feldmeilen (Zürich), Switzerland
Nielsen, Peder, Silkeborg, Denmark
Peris, S. V., Estacion Experimental de " Aula Dei," Zaragoza, Spain
Saccà, Giuseppe, Istituto Superiore di Sanita, Roma, Italy
Sara, M. M., Istituto e Museo di Zoologia, Univ. di Napoli, Napoli, Italy
Schmitz, H., Alosiuskolleg, Bad Godesberg, Germany
Strenzke, K., Hydrobiologische Anstalt der Max-Planck-Gesellschaft, Plön. (Holstein), Germany
Thienemann, A., Hydrobiologische Anstalt der Max-Planck-Gesellschaft, Plön (Holstein), Germany
Tjeder, Bo, Falun, Sweden
Tuomikoski, R. K., Temppelik, 7, Helsinki, Finland
Tuxen, S. L., Universitetets Zoologiske Museum, København, Denmark

Vanschuytbroeck, Paul, Institut royal des Sciences naturelles de Belgique, Bruxelles, Belgium

Venturi, F., Istituto di Entomologia Agraria, Univ. di Pisa, Pisa, Italy

Verbeke, J., Commonwealth Bureau of Biological Control, Feldmeilen (Zürich), Switzerland

Weyer, Fritz, Institut für Schiffs und Tropenkrankheiten, Hamburg, Germany

Africa

De Meillon, B., South African Institute for Medical Research, Johannesburg, South Africa

Efflatoun, H. C., Faculty of Science, Fouad I University, Cairo, Egypt

Heinz, H. J., South African Institute for Medical Research, Johannesburg, South Africa

Hesse, A. J., South African Museum, Cape Town, South Africa

Machado, A. de Barros, Museu do Dundo, Diamang, Angola

Munro, H. K., Dept. of Agriculture, Pretoria, Union of South Africa (comment indicated that the vote should be counted " Yes " in general)

Muspratt, J., South African Institute for Medical Research, Johannesburg, South Africa

Parrot, L., Institut Pasteur d'Algerie, Algiers, Algeria

Paterson, H. A., South African Institute for Medical Research, Johannesburg, South Africa

Vaillant, F., Université d'Alger, Algiers, Algeria

Zumpt, F., South African Institute for Medical Research, Johannesburg, South Africa

Asia

Baisas, F. E., Public Health Research Labs., Manila, Philippines

Esaki, Teiso, Kyushu Univ., Fukuoka, Japan

Kato, Schizuo, National Agricultural Research Institute, Tokyo, Japan

Lever, R. J. A. W., Dept. of Agriculture, Kuala Lumpur, Malaya

Menon, M. A. U., Public Health Lab., Trivandrum, Travancore, India

Nayar, K. K., University College, Trivandrum, Travancore, India

Reid, J. A., Institute for Medical Research, Kuala Lumpur, Malaya

Australasia

Hardy, G. H., Katoomba, New South Wales (retired)

Harrison, R. A., Plant Diseases Division, Auckland, New Zealand

Lee, David J., School of Public Health, The University, Sydney, Australia

Lower, H. F., Univ. of Adelaide, Adelaide, Australia

Mackerras, I. M., Queensland Institute of Medical Research, Brisbane, Queensland

Marks, Miss E. N., University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia

Norris, K. R., Council for Scientific and Industrial Research, Canberra, A.C.T.

Paramonov, S. J., Council for Scientific and Industrial Research, Canberra, A.C.T.

Salmon, J. T., Victoria Univ. College, Wellington, New Zealand

Satchell, G. H., Univ. of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand

Womersley, H., South Australian Museum, Adelaide, Australia

B. REPLIES OPPOSED TO THE PROPOSAL

United States and Canada

Hardy, D. E., Univ. of Hawaii, Honolulu, Hawaii
Kessel, E. L., Univ. of San Francisco, San Francisco, Calif.
McAlpine, J. F., Dept. of Agriculture, Ottawa, Ont., Canada
Pechuman, L. L., 7 Davison Road, Lockport, N.Y.
Remington, C. L., Yale Univ., New Haven, Conn.
Shewell, G. E., Dept. of Agriculture, Ottawa, Ont., Canada
Stone, Alan, U.S. Bureau of Ent. & Plant Quar., Washington, D.C.
Townes, H. K., North Carolina State College, Raleigh, N.C.
Vockeroth, J. R., Dept. of Agriculture, Ottawa, Ont., Canada
Wirth, W. W., U.S. Bureau of Ent. & Plant Quar., Washington, D.C.

Latin America

Aczél, M., Instituto Miguel Lillo, Tucuman, Argentina
Barbosa, F. A. S., Instituto Aggeu Magalhaes, Recife, Pernambuco, Brazil

Continental Europe

d'Aguilar, J., Station Centrale de Zoologie Agricole, Versailles, France
Barendrecht, G., Zoologisch Laboratorium der Universiteit, Amsterdam, Netherlands
Doesburg, P. H. van, Sr., Cantonlaan 1, Baarn, Netherlands
Dupuis, Claude, Laboratoire d'Helminthologie Coloniale et de Parasitologie Comparée, Paris, France
Hennig, Willi, Deutsches Entomologisches Institut, Berlin-Friedrichshagen, Germany
Laven, H., Bernhard-Nocht-Institut für Schiffs-und Tropenkrankheiten, Hamburg, Germany
Mannheims, Bernhard, Museum Alexander Koenig, Bonn (Rhein), Germany
Marcuzzi, G., Istituto di Zoologia, Univ. di Padova, Padova, Italy
Mayer, Karl, Biologische Zentralanstalt für Land und Forstwirtschaft, Kleinmachnow bei Berlin, Berlin, Germany
Peus, Fritz, Zoologisches Museum, Berlin, Germany
Sachtleben, H., Deutsches Entomologisches Institut, Berlin-Friedrichshagen, Germany
Séguy, E., Museum National d'Histoire naturelle, Paris, France
Theowald, Br., Stadhouderskade 60, Amsterdam, Netherlands

Africa

Lumsden, W. H. R., Virus Research Institute, Entebbe, Uganda

Asia

Okada, Toyohi, Tokyo Metropolitan Univ., Tokyo, Japan
Shiraki, Tokuichi, 20 Nagasaki-2 Chome, Tokyo, Japan

C. AUTHORS WHO HAVE CHANGED USAGE (QUESTION 3)

Source	1803 to 1800		1800 to 1803	
	Name	Date Changed	Name	Date Changed
United States and Canada	Belkin	1942		
	Bohart, G. E.	1945		
	Brookman	1946		
	Brooks	1942		
	Hall, D. G.	1938		
	Hardy, D. E.	1939		
	James	1941		
	Johannsen	1952		
	Kessel	1940		
	King	1941		
	Fluke	1949	Fluke	1950
	Pechuman	1946		
	Philip	1937		
	Pritchard	1939		
	Remington	1943		
	Roback	1950		
	Sabrosky	1945		
	Snyder	1938-40		
	Steyskal	1951		
	Stone	1941		
	Shewell	" after the war "		
	Townes	1940		
Great Britain			Niblett	1949
			Oldroyd	By 1945
Continental Europe	Barendrecht	c.1935	Collart	1939
	Dupuis	By 1951	Mesnil	1951
	Lengersdorf	1930	Vanschuytbroeck	1950
	Kröber	1910 ?		
	Mayer	1940		
	Nielsen, Peder	1932		
	Soot-Ryen	c. 1930		
Africa	Vaillant	" lately "	Efflatoun	1945
			Zumpt	?
Asia	Okada	1936	Nayar	?
	Shiraki	1912		

APPENDIX 4

Reaction of dipterists to changing family names only when type genera are found to be homonyms (Question 6)

A question (the question whether it would be desirable that a family name should be liable to change only when the name of its type was found to be a homonym—Question 6) was added to the Meigen questionnaire as a general question to sample opinion of a body of practising taxonomists in a group where the principle would be of importance. It is well illustrated by the family names based on Meigen 1803 names and their counterparts in the 1800 names. The point is not directly involved in the Meigen application, and some replies questioned whether the inclusion of the matter along with the survey would give a fair answer unprejudiced by attitudes on the controversial Meigen names. On the other hand, it might also be argued that the situation in Diptera involving the Meigen names and their associated family names is the best possible example of the value of having a rule that would avoid any more changes than are absolutely necessary.

Replies to the question (question 6 on the Meigen questionnaire) totalled 166, of which 114 or 69% replied that they favoured a general rule that required changing a family name *only* when the type genus is found to be a homonym, and not when it is found to be a synonym.

If the Meigen 1800 paper is suppressed, the point will not matter to dipterists, at least insofar as the 1800 vs. 1803 names are concerned. If the 1800 paper is not suppressed, then the point will be an important consideration.

The voting on the question was distributed as follows:

Summary of Answers received to Question 6

Source	Yes	No	Per cent. Yes
United States and Canada ..	48	17	74
Latin America	10	4	71
Great Britain	15	8	65
Continental Europe	21	15	58
Africa	9	2	82
Asia	4	4	50
Australasia	7	2	78
Totals	114	52	69

A REQUEST FOR THE USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO PRESERVE THE GENERIC NAMES IN GEOFFROY (1762) IN THE ORDER DIPTERA (CLASS INSECTA)

By ALAN STONE, C. W. SABROSKY, W. W. WIRTH and R. H. FOOTE
(*Division of Insect Detection and Identification, Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)710)

The decision of the Paris Congress to substitute the word "binominal" for the word "binary" in the Code, as applied retroactively to works that have long been accepted by taxonomists, will, in our opinion, cause many serious disturbances to stability and continuity. We accordingly disagree strongly with the decision taken at Paris, and feel that the previous wording of the Code, which has stood for nearly a half century, should have been left undisturbed. If problems existed in some groups, they could have been solved by exercise of the Plenary Powers of the Commission. However, we shall make no further issue of this, and we accept the decision, albeit reluctantly.

2. It becomes necessary, therefore, as the Commission itself has suggested (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 368), to consider in the Order Diptera the status of the generic names uniformly accepted by dipterists as dating from Geoffroy.

3. The publication of immediate concern to us is the *Histoire abrégée des insectes qui se trouvent aux environs de Paris*. All of the dipterous names occur in the second volume. This work was first published in 1762 without indication of authorship and republished in 1764 with Geoffroy given as the author. While some of the publications listed below have cited the names in question as from 1764, Sherborn (*Index Animalium*) adopted the date af 1762, and this is apparently correct. If a generic name is credited to Geoffroy, it must date back to 1762. As a matter of record, however, in the following list of references we indicate by (o) that no date was given, by (*) that the date 1764 was used, and by (!) that some other erroneous deviation from Geoffroy, 1762, was employed. Unmarked references cite the date correctly as 1762.

4. We have reviewed Geoffroy's entire work and find only thirteen generic names of Diptera. These are first listed on pages 447-448 with the French vernacular names, followed by a diagnosis of each in French, and then on pages 449-450 the Latin names followed by Latin diagnoses. There follows a section describing the genera more fully, with descriptions of the included species. These species are not named binominally, though some can be identified by the citations to the Linnaean species. Of the thirteen generic names, six are proposed for the first time in this publication. These are as follows :—

(i) *Stratiomys* (: 449, 475). Eight species. Type species : *Musca chamaeleon* Linnaeus, the first species, by selection of Latreille, 1810.

(ii) *Stomoxys* (: 449, 538). One species. Type species : *Conops calcitrans* Linnaeus, monobasic.

(iii) *Volucella* (: 449, 540). Three species. Type species : *Musca pellucens* Linnaeus, the first species, by selection of Curtis, 1833.

(iv) *Nemotelus* (: 450, 542). Two species. Type species: *Musca pantherina* Linnaeus, the first species, by selection of Latreille, 1810 (as *uliginosus* L. and *marginatus* L.).

(v) *Scatopse* (: 450 and as *Scathopse* : 544-545). Two species. Type species: *Tipula notata* Linnaeus, the first species, by selection of Latreille, 1810. (The spelling *Scatopse* is preferred because it is currently and universally accepted, it has predominated in past years, and it has page precedence in the original.)

(vi) *Bibio* (: 450, 568). Five species. Type species: *Tipula hortulana* Linnaeus, the third species, by selection of Latreille, 1810.

5. The overthrow of these common, widely used, and important generic names, which are the oldest in the Order Diptera next to the Linnaean names, would be most unfortunate and would upset or threaten stability in these long-established names. At the present time, and throughout virtually all the history of dipterology, the six names have been accepted as dating from Geoffroy, with rare exceptions that are in most cases undoubtedly lapses or typographical errors (e.g. Curran, 1927, and Walker, 1851, see below, under *Stratiomys* : Curran, 1934, see below under General Works). If the Geoffroy names were to be eliminated, the consequences shown in the four immediately following paragraphs would result :—

6. A laborious search of the literature after 1762 would have to be carried out in order to determine the next use of each of these six names that would be acceptable under the Code, with the realisation that validation by citation in synonymy might also occur. We can think of no more barren labour than such a search, which should have been totally unnecessary (see introductory paragraph) and is certainly unwanted and undesirable. The result of such a search would be to change the dates and authorship of the six names, changes which, though apparently not serious, would nevertheless mean incorrect citations for many years to come.

7. The change of date and authorship would raise the question of whether a type designation for a Geoffroy genus can be accepted as a designation for the same name when it is dated from some other author.

8. The change of date and authorship would mean that a different species might be eligible for fixation as type species, with a possible change of concept that would set in motion some confusing changes. For example, if *Bibio* Geoffroy is eliminated, the next use of *Bibio* appears to be[1] that of Fabricius (1775, *Systema Entomologiae* : 756-759), in which the fourteen included species are now scattered among much younger genera in the three families STRATIOMYIDAE, THEREVIDAE, and BOMBYLIIDAE. The generic name *Bibio* would thus supplant the name of some genus in another family. The fate of the family name BIBIONIDAE would no doubt be an argument in itself, but it certainly could not remain the BIBIONIDAE as we know the family today. *Volucella* offers another example, for the first valid use subsequent to Geoffroy (not counting references in specific synonymies) seems to be (1) that of Fabricius (1794, *Entomologia systematica* **4** : 412-413), who used *Voluccella* (note the difference in spelling !) for three species, all now placed in the genus *Usia* Latreille, 1804, in the family BOMBYLIIDAE. Thus the name *Volucella* (and subfamily VOLUCELLINAE) would disappear from the SYRPHIDAE where it has long been one of the largest and best known genera.

---

[1] These changes appear to be necessary, from our perusal of well-known works such as those of Fabricius, Scopoli, De Geer, etc. It will be impossible to make categorical statements without an extensive search of the literature.

9. The change of date and authorship may mean, even for that early period in entomological activity, that the names would be antedated by others that are now placed in the synonymy of the Geoffroy names. Example: If *Stratiomys* is eliminated from Geoffroy (1762), the next valid name for that genus is *Hirtea* Scopoli, 1763 (*Entomologia carniolica*: 367, monobasic for *H. longicornis* Scopoli), a change which would also result in changing the family name STRATIOMYIDAE to HIRTEIDAE.

10. In view of the uniform acceptance of these six names as dating from Geoffroy, 1762, and in view of the grave difficulties, either already known or suspected, that would arise from the elimination of that work, we propose that the Rules be suspended and that these six generic names be dated for purposes of priority from Geoffroy, 1762, with the type species as given in paragraph 4 above.

11. As examples of the wide usage of these names of Geoffroy, 1762, we may cite the following general works:—

* 1862-64 Schiner, *Fauna austriaca*. Die Fliegen. 2 vols.
o 1877 Schneider, *Enumeratio Insectorum norvegicum*. (All but *Bibio*.)
o 1877 Van der Wulp, *Diptera neerlandica*. (All but *Stomoxys*.)
* 1878 Osten Sacken, *Catalogue of the Described Diptera of North America*, 2nd Edition.
* 1882 Scudder, *Nomenclator zoologicus*.
1902 Sherborn, *Index Animalium*.
* 1902-10 Kertesz, *Catalogus Dipterorum*. (All but *Stomoxys*.)
* 1903-07 Becker, Bezzi, Bischof, Kertesz, and Stein, *Katalog der Paläarktischen Dipteren*. Vols. **1-3**.
* 1905 Aldrich, *A Catalogue of the North American Diptera*.
o 1905-09 Wahlgren, *Svensk Insektfauna*. Tvavingar. Diptera. (All but *Stomoxys*).
1910 Coquillett, *The Type Species of the North American Genera of Diptera*.
o 1925 Johnson, *Fauna of New England* **15**. List of Diptera or Two-Winged Flies.
1926-39 Schulze and Kükenthal, *Nomenclator Animalium Generum et Subgenerum*.
o 1928 Johannsen, *in* Leonard, *A List of the Insects of New York*.
o 1934 Curran, *The Families and Genera of North American Diptera*. (All but *Bibio*, which is credited to Latreille.)
* 1936 Enderlein, *Die Tierwelt Mitteleuropas*, Band **6**, Teil 3, Lief. 2, Abt. 16 (Diptera).
o 1938 Brimley, *The Insects of North Carolina*.
1939-40 Neave, *Nomenclator zoologicus*, vols. **1** and **3**.
1945 Kloet and Hincks, *A Check List of the British Insects*.
o 1946 Stuardo, O., *Catalogo de los Dipteros de Chile*. (All but *Bibio*.)

12. Examples of the specialised publications that have used these names are as follows:—

(i) Stratiomys (Sometimes emended to *Stratiomyia*)

! 1851 Walker, *Insecta britannica*, Diptera **1**: 13. (Date given as 1784.)
* 1895 Johnson, *Trans. Amer. ent. Soc.* **22**: 227.
o 1907 Lundbeck, *Diptera danica*, Part 1, p. 40.
* 1907 Brunetti, *Rec. Indian Mus.* **1**: 125.
* 1909 Verrall, *British Flies* **5**: 146.
o 1917 Malloch, *Bull. Illinois State Lab. nat. Hist.* **12**: 318.
* 1920 Brunetti, *Fauna of British India*, Diptera Brachycera **1**: 58. (It is interesting to note that the editor, Shipley, appended the following note: "In this work Geoffroy did not accept the binary system of nomenclature upon which all modern zoological classification is based;

it has therefore been ruled that all generic names therein proposed by him are just as invalid as pre-Linnaean names. The authorship of *Stratiomys* should thus be attributed to Fabricius.")

*	1923	Brunetti, *Rec. Indian Mus.* **25** : 115.
!	1927	Curran, *Trans. Roy Soc. Canada,* **1927** Sec. V, p. 199. (As *Stratiomys* Latreille.)
o	1930	Aubertin, *Dipt. Patagonia & S. Chile,* Part 5, fasc. 2, p. 97.
*	1938	Lindner, *Die Fliegen der Palaearktischen Region,* Bd. **4**, Fam. 18, p. 47.

(ii) Stomoxys

	1909	Austen, *African Blood-Sucking Flies,* p. 141.
o	1911	Schnabl and Dziedzicki, *Die Anthomyiden,* p. 125.
*	1919	Stein, *Die Anthomyidengattungen der Welt, . . .,* Archiv. Naturgesch. A 1, **83**, (1) : 102.
o	1923	Séguy, *Faune de France,* Diptères, Anthomyides, p. 342.
*	1928	Karl, *Die Tierwelt Deutschlands,* Teil **13**, Dipt. II, Muscidae, p. 14.
	1932	Malloch, *Exotic Muscaridae* **36** (World revision of Muscidae, Stomoxydinae), Ann. & Mag. Nat. Hist. (10) **9** : 381.
*	1937	Séguy, *in* Wytsman, *Genera Insectorum,* fasc. **205**, Diptera, Muscidae, p. 423.
*	1939	Zumpt, *Das System der Stomoxydinae,* Verh. VII. Internat. Kongr. Ent. **3** : 1732.
o	1948	James, *The Flies That Cause Myiasis in Man,* U.S. Dept. Agr. Misc. Publ. **631** : 132.
*	1950	Miller, *Catalogue of the Diptera of the New Zealand Subregion,* p. 125.
*	1950	Zumpt, *Key to the Stomoxydinae of the Ethiopian Region,* Anais do Inst. Med. Trop. **7** : 401.
*	1951	Zimin, Muscidae, in *Fauna U.S.S.R.,* **18** (4) : 249.

(iii) Volucella

!	1851	Walker, *Insecta britannica,* Diptera **1** : 260 (Date given as 1776).
*	1886	Williston, *Synopsis of North American Syrphidae,* p. 134.
	1891	Williston, *Biologia centrali-americana,* Diptera **3** : 43.
*	1901	Verrall, *British Flies* **8** : 482.
o	1916	Lundbeck, *Diptera danica* **5** : 395.
*	1923	Brunetti, *Fauna of British India,* Diptera **3** : 144.
o	1928	Curran, *J. Fed. Malay States Museum* **14** : 160.
*	1930	Shriaki, *Mem. Fac. Sci. Agric. Taihoku Imp.* Univ. **1** : 213.
*	1930	Curran, *Amer. Mus. Novitates* **413** : 6.
*	1932	Sack, *in* Lindner, *Die Fliegen der Palaearktischen Region,* Bd. **4**, Fam. 31 : 241.
*	1933	Shannon and Aubertin, *Dipt. Patagonia & S. Chile,* Pt. **6**, fasc. 3, p. 167.
*	1949	Hull, *Trans. zool. Soc. Lond.* **26** : 347.

(iv) Nemotelus

!	1851	Walker, *Insecta britannica,* Diptera **1** : 25. (Date given as 1784.)
o	1907	Lundbeck, *Diptera danica,* part 1, p. 23.
*	1907	Brunetti, *Rec. Indian Mus.* **1** : 117.
*	1909	Verrall, *British Flies* **5** : 113.
o	1917	Malloch, *Bull. Illinois State Lab. nat. Hist.* **12** : 318.
*	1923	Brunetti, *Rec. Indian Mus.* **25**: 87.
o	1927	Curran, *Trans. Roy Soc. Canada,* **1927** Sec. V, p. 223

o 1930 Aubertin, *Dipt. Patagonia & S. Chile*, pt. 5, fasc. 2, p. 97 (in key).
* 1938 Lindner, *Die Fliegen der Palaearktischen Region*, Bd. **4**, Fam. 18, p. 107.

(v) Scatopse

* 1856 Walker, *Insecta britannica*, Diptera **3** : 140.
* 1912 Brunetti, *Fauna of British India*, p. 179.
* 1916 Melander, "The Dipterous Family Scatopsidae," *State College of Washington Expt. Sta. Bull.* **130** : 6.
o 1921 McAtee, "District of Columbia Diptera," *Scatopsidae, Proc. Ent. Soc. Washington* **23** : 121.
o 1925 Edwards, "A Synopsis of British Bibionidae and Scatopsidae," *Ann. Appl. Biol.* **12** : 268.
o 1928 Duda, *Beitrag zur Kenntnis der aussereuropäischen Scatopsiden*. Knowia **7** : 259.
o 1929 Duda, *in* Lindner, *Die Fliegen der Palaearktischen Region*, Bd. **2**, Fam. 5, Scatopsidae, p. 9.
o 1948 Hennig, *Die Larvenformen der Dipteren* **1** : 90.

(vi) Bibio

* 1856 Walker, *Insecta britannica*, Diptera **3** : 134.
o 1859 Bellardi, *Saggio di Ditterologia Messicana* **1** : 16.
1886 Osten Sacken, *Biologia centrali-americana*, Diptera **1** : 3.
* 1912 Brunetti, *Fauna of British India*, p. 166.
o 1921 McAtee, "Notes on Nearctic bibionid flies," *Proc. U.S. Nat. Mus.* **60** (11) : 6.
o 1925 Edwards, "A Synopsis of British Bibionidae and Scatopsidae," *Ann. Appl. Biol.* **12** : 266.
* 1930 Duda, *in* Lindner, *Die Fliegen der Palaearktischen Region*, Bd. **2**, Fam. 4, Bibionidae, p. 38.
* 1945 Hardy, "Revision of Nearctic Bibionidae . . .," *Kansas Univ. Sci. Bul.* **30** : 444.

13. The action which the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is now asked to take is therefore that it should :—

(1) use its Plenary Powers to validate the under-mentioned generic names with the type species specified below :—

Name of genus	*Type species*
(*a*) *Stratiomys* Geoffroy, 1762, *Hist. abrég. Ins. Env. Paris* **2** : 449, 475 (gender : feminine)	*Musca chamaeleon* Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** 589
(*b*) *Stomoxys* Geoffroy, 1762, *ibid.* **2** : 449, 538 (gender : feminine)	*Conops calcitrans* Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 604
(*c*) *Volucella* Geoffroy, 1762, *ibid.* **2** : 449, 540 (gender : feminine)	*Musca pellucens* Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 595
(*d*) *Nemotelus* Geoffroy, 1762, *ibid.* **2** : 450, 542 (gender : masculine)	*Musca pantherina* Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 590

(*e*) *Scatopse* Geoffroy, 1762, *ibid.* **2** : 450 (as *Scathopse* on pp. 544-545) (gender : feminine)	*Tipula notata* Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 588
(*f*) *Bibio* Geoffroy, 1762, *ibid.* **2** : 450, 568 (gender : masculine)	*Tipula hortulana* Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 588

(2) place the six generic names specified in (1) above on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* :

(3) place on the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* the specific names of the six species specified in (1) above as the type species of the genera there enumerated ;

(4) place the name *Scathopse* Geoffroy, 1762 (: 544-545) (an incorrect spelling of the name *Scatopse* Geoffroy, 1762 (: 450)) on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology.*

PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO SUPPRESS "PALMATOTRITON" SMITH 1945 (CLASS AMPHIBIA, ORDER CAUDATA)

By HOBART M. SMITH

(*Department of Zoology, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois, U.S.A.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)594)

In a popular article ("Herpetological Collecting in Banana Fields of Mexico") published in volume 19, number 1, 1945, page 4 of Ward's *Natural Science Bulletin* (a widely distributed and regularly published journal of Ward's Natural Science Establishment, Rochester, New York) there appeared for the first time the generic name *Palmatotriton*. This name occurs in the following verbatim context: "Commonest in central Veracruz are the salamanders especially *Palmatotriton rufescens*, a small, broad-footed species about two inches long. This species is incredibly common, generally several occurring under each stalk. Yet, before this habitat and method of hunting was discovered, the species was considered to be rather rare, for only seven specimens were known from Mexico and thirteen from all other countries within range!"

2. As author of that article and of the passage quoted, I know the species referred to is the one now recognised (by Smith and Taylor, 1948, *Bull. U.S. nat. Mus.* **194** : 23 ; *et al.*) as *Bolitogrossa rufescens* (Cope), originally described as *Oedipus rufescens* Cope, 1869 (*Proc. Acad. nat. Sci. Philad.* **21** : 104). The specific name has been cited under no other combination, so far as we are aware.

3. To other authors it may be equally as apparent as to me that the species referred to is the one cited above, but this is true only because of their knowledge of esoteric information: they know the fauna of central Veracruz, or the habitat of the species, or which species in that area would be two inches long and broad-footed (no other is), or which species having these characteristics was known at the time of the last monograph prior to 1945 (Dunn, *Salamanders of the Family Plethodontidae*, 1926, p. 418) from only seven Mexican and thirteen non-Mexican specimens.

4. The name *Palmatotriton* was used under the erroneous impression that it was to be published prior to the date this article appeared by another author who at one time intended that it should be used for the group of species to which *rufescens* Cope belongs, as distinct from other species now included with *rufescens* in *Bolitoglossa*. That author later, unknown to me, determined not to segregate generically *rufescens* and its relatives from *Bolitoglossa*.

5. That it was my intent in 1945 to utilise a name already available, and definitely not to anticipate the other author's use, is not itself of significance, although if decision on the status of the name were not clearly indicated, intent might justifiably be considered. The status of the name is, on the contrary, clearly indicated.

6. Mr. Francis Hemming has pointed out, in reply to my query on this matter, that "under the amendment of Article 25 adopted by the Tenth International Congress of Zoology at Budapest in 1927 (which came into operation as from 1st January 1931) a name published in the way in which the name *Palmatotriton* was published would have possessed no availability, for no type species was designated for this genus. This portion of Article 25 was however considered further by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology at Paris in 1948 in the light of representations which had been received by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature that to refuse availability on the foregoing ground to a generic name published for a genus for which one species only was cited was unduly legalistic. The Paris Congress decided to modify the decision of the Budapest Congress in such a way as to confer availability upon a generic name published after 31st December 1931 for a monotypic genus even if no type species was explicitly designated by the original author of the generic name in question (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 72). The Paris Congress decided further to include in the *Règles* a provision making it clear that a nominal genus established with only one cited species is to be treated as a monotypical genus (1950, *ibid* **4** : 153). We see therefore that under the *Règles* the generic name *Palmatotriton* must be regarded as having been validly published—though inadvertently and in an irregular manner—as from Smith, 1945, for it was provided with an 'indication' for the purposes of Article 25 by having been published with an 'indicated' type species (by monotypy). It is true that no author's name was cited for the species indicated as type species under the name *Palmatotriton rufescens* and that a certain amount of specialised knowledge is necessary in order to identify that species with the nominal species *Oedipus rufescens* Cope, 1869, but this cannot be held out as an argument against the availability of the generic name *Palmatotriton*, for zoological literature abounds with instances of generic names—some of them extremely well-known names in very common use—which were published with cited species for which no author's names were given by the original author of the name. Moreover, it is impossible to point to any provision in the *Règles* which would give any colour to the contention that a generic name so published does not possess availability."

7. In the foregoing circumstances the name *Palmatotriton* Smith, 1945, cannot legitimately be regarded either as a *nomen nudum* or as a *nomen dubium*. On the other hand, the name was published inadvertently and it could not fail to give rise to confusion if it were permitted to retain availability for nomenclatorial purposes. It is accordingly recommended that, in order to avoid this undesirable situation from arising, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should use its Plenary Powers to suppress this name altogether. This name would then become available for use by any later author either as the name for a genus containing *Oedipus rufescens* Cope or in any other sense. It is suggested also that it would be convenient to take the present opportunity to place on the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* the specific name *rufescens* Cope, 1869, as published in the binominal combination *Oedipus rufescens*, that name being the oldest available specific name of an extremely common and well-known species of salamander.

8. The proposal now submitted is that the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should :—

(1) use its Plenary Powers to suppress the generic name *Palmatotriton* Smith, 1945, for the purposes both of the Law of Priority and of the Law of Homonymy ;

(2) place the name *Palmatotriton* Smith, 1945, as proposed, under (1) above, to be suppressed under the Plenary Powers, on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* :

(3) place the specific name *rufescens* Cope, 1869, as published in the binominal combination *Oedipus rufescens*, on the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology*.

PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO DESIGNATE (i) A NEOTYPE FOR THE NOMINAL SPECIES "AMMONITES MAMMILLATUS" SCHLOTHEIM, 1813, AND (ii) A TYPE SPECIES FOR THE GENUS "DOUVILLEICERAS" DE GROSSOUVRE, 1893 (CLASS CEPHALOPODA, ORDER AMMONOIDEA)

By R. CASEY
(*Geological Survey and Museum, London*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.) 631)

The present application to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature deals with the problem raised by *Ammonites mammillatus* Schlotheim, 1813. It was originally submitted in accordance with the extension of the Plenary Powers granted to the Commission by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology in Paris in 1948 for the purpose of determining how the *Règles* should be applied in cases where it was doubtful to what species a given name should be held to apply (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 324). Since the Copenhagen Congress of 1953, this application has been re-written as a request for the designation of a neotype for the foregoing species. It is important for palaeontological and stratigraphical nomenclature that the name of the nominal species *Ammonites mammillatus* Schlotheim, 1813, should be stabilised in the sense in which it is now almost universally applied. It is particularly hoped that the International Commission will give this application all practicable priority, as a decision on it is urgently required in connection with the preparation of the forthcoming *Treatise on Invertebrate Paleontology*.

2. *Ammonites mammillatus* Schlotheim is the type species of the genus *Douvilleiceras* de Grossouvre, 1893 (on which is based the family DOUVILLEICERATIDAE Parona and Bonarelli) and the name *Douvilleiceras mammillatum* connotes one of the most familiar and important index fossils in Cretaceous stratigraphy. The Mammillatum Zone is world-wide and in using the term we follow the practice of four generations of geologists and stratigraphers. Yet, as is shown below, if the *Règles* are permitted to pursue the normal course, the name *D. mammillatum* would be virtually abandoned, the genus *Douvilleiceras* would remain forever taxonomically inassessable, and an unfamiliar zonal terminology would supplant the well-known "Mammillatum Zone."

3. When proposing the combination *Ammonites mammillatus*, Schlotheim (1813 : 111) did not himself illustrate or describe the species but referred to a figure in Walch (1774 : 196, pl. ii, fig. 3). This indication renders the name available, and in so far as I have been unable to trace a use of the combination *Ammonites mammillatus* prior to that of Schlotheim, or any earlier indication for the original of the Walch figure in question, the name is an available name and the oldest such name for the species in question.

Bull. zool. Nomencl. Vol. 9, Pt. 8. May, 1954.

4. Unfortunately, Walch's figure is defective in three respects: (*a*) It depicts a nucleus or an immature specimen, (*b*) it shows the specimen in side view only, and (*c*) it falls far short of what is required by modern standards of illustration. Owing to these facts, it is not possible to determine with certainty the taxonomic species represented by Walch's figure. Hyatt (1903 : 108) observed that " The figure given by Walch seems to apply to the young of the form usually cited by authors as *mammillaris* and figured by d'Orbigny under this revised name." In Spath's view " Walch's original figure . . . may be identical with the distantly ribbed *D. inaequinodum* (Quenstedt) " (Spath, 1923 : 67). To Breistroffer (1947 : 64) Walch's figure " appears to represent a specimen from the Ardennes analogous to *D. orbignyi* Hyatt." In my opinion, the figure in question was probably based on one of the coarsely ribbed species of *Douvilleiceras*, such as *D. inaequinodum* (Quenstedt). *D. orbignyi* Hyatt, or *D. baylei* Spath, but I consider it unsafe to assume this: alternatively it could represent a member of the MANTELLICERATIDAE.

5. The original of Walch's figure is of unknown provenance, and, if it still exists, its present whereabouts are not known.

6. For over a century palaeonotologists have ignored Walch's figure and have based their conception of *Ammonites mammillatus* on figures supplied by later authors. Chief among these are the two plates of ammonites depicted in d'Orbigny's *Paléontologie francaise* (1841 : pls. 72-3) under the name *A. mammillaris* (an unjustified emendation of *A. mammillatus*). D'Orbigny's interpretation of Schlotheim's species was very broad and his figured examples of " *A. mammillaris* " (with which he synonymised *A. monile* Sowerby (J.). 1816) have since been referred to several distinct species of *Douvilleiceras*. This broad interpretation of *A. mammillatus* was current throughout most of the nineteenth century, but towards its close Parona and Bonarelli adopted the name *D. inaequinodum* (=*A. monile inaequinodus* Quenstedt, 1849) for the coarsely ribbed species of *Douvilleiceras*. such as illustrated in d'Orbigny's plate 73, restricting the name *D. mammillatum* to the forms with more closely spaced ribs, of which the originals of d'Orbigny's plate 72 and J. Sowerby's *A. monile* provided examples (Parona and Bonarelli, 1897 : 95). Zittel in 1895 (: 429, fig. 429) had already chosen a specimen of this latter group to illustrate *D.* " *mammillare* " and his figure, generalised but in agreement with *D. mammillatum* in its current conception, has been reproduced in all the many editions and translations of his well-known text-book. To this restriction of d'Orbigny's comprehensive *A.* " *mammillaris*." Hyatt (1903 : 109) and Jacob (1907 : 370) added their authority.

7. De Grossouvre designated " *A. mamillaris* "[*sic.*] [*recte A. mammillatus*], without an attached author's name. as the type species of his nominal genus *Douvilleiceras*, and the suture-line alone was figured (de Grossouvre. 1893 : 23, 26). Hence there is no published evidence to show in what taxonomic sense de Grossouvre used the specific name *A. mammillatus*. Fortunately, specimens of *Douvilleiceras* formerly in de Grossouvre's collection and labelled by him are preserved both in the British Museum (Natural History) and in the Sedgwick Museum at Cambridge and inspection of these shows clearly that his interpretation of *A. mammillatus* agreed with that of Parona and Bonarelli.

8. Thus, the use of *A. mammillatus* for the closely ribbed *Douvilleiceras*, rather than for the coarsely ribbed species to which Walch's original probably belonged, had become established even before the present century. In his monograph of the Gault Ammonoidea Spath wrote : " It seems desirable to employ the term *D. mammillatum* in the generally accepted interpretation of Parona and Bonarelli, excluding, however, the finely costate D. *monile* (J. Sowerby) " (Spath, 1923 : 69). At the same time Spath proposed the nominal species *Douvilleiceras albense*, to which are now referred the originals of d'Orbigny's plate 72, figs. 3-5 (Breistroffer, 1947 : 65) ; he retained only the originals of d'Orbigny's plate 72, figs. 1-2 in *D. mammillatum.* Spath's monograph is the modern reference book for the student of Albian stratigraphy and ammonitology and the definition of *D. mammillatum* contained therein has become standardised throughout the world, the species being generally quoted as *D. mammillatum* (Schlotheim), emend. Spath.

9. In 1947, however, Breistroffer, acting strictly in accordance with the provisions of Article 25, adopted a different nomenclature for the species of *Douvilleiceras.* For *D. mammillatum* (Schlotheim) emend. Spath, he revived Quenstedt's name *aequinodus* (originally published in the trinominal combination *Ammonites monile aequinodus*) and he proposed to call the zone of *D. mammillatum* " the zone of *D. monile* and *D. orbignyi* " (Breistroffer, 1947 : 51). Breistroffer's nomenclature has not been adopted by other ammonite specialists nor by stratigraphers, who have continued to use *D. mammillatum* as an index-fossil and in the taxonomic sense defined by Spath (see, for instance, Collignon, 1949 : 76 ; Stoyanow, 1949 : 36 ; Casey, 1950 : 270, 292 ; 1951).

10. If, as proposed by Breistroffer, the *Règles* be allowed to take their normal course, the situation would be as follows :—

(*a*) *Ammonites mammillatus* Schlotheim, 1813, would be interpreted by the figure in Walch referred to above, and, since this is indeterminate, the name could be applied to no other specimen.

(*b*) The genus *Douvilleiceras* de Grossouvre, 1893, with type species by original designation *Ammonites mammillatus* Schlotheim, 1813 (cited by de Grossouvre in the incorrectly spelt, and in the unjustifiably emended, form *mamillaris*), would have an insecure foundation and would for ever be a source of uncertainty to the taxonomist. Established nomenclature could be upset at any time by an irresponsible author who might claim subjectively to have identified Walch's figure with, say, a species of *Mantelliceras* or some other genus.

(*c*) The family DOUVILLEICERATIDAE Parona and Bonarelli, would have a similar unsatisfactory basis.

(*d*) Another, unfamiliar, name would be required for the taxonomic species to which the combination *Douvilleiceras mammillatum* is now almost universally applied.

(*e*) The term " Mammillatum Zone " could no longer be used in stratigraphy.

11. Serious confusion in stratigraphy and palaeontology would result from this situation. To avoid this confusion I recommend that the International Commission should make use of its Plenary Powers to designate the specimen figured by Spath in 1923 (*Monograph of the Gault Ammonoidea*) as figures 3a and 3b on plate 4, to be the neotype of the nominal species *Ammonites mammillatus* Schlotheim, 1813. In choosing this specimen, I am guided by the following considerations: (*a*) It is a clearly identifiable specimen of the species accepted as representing D. *mammillatum* by the overwhelming majority of workers. (*b*) It is accurately localised in the classic Albian section at Folkestone, Kent, itself a standard of comparison for Europe; topotype specimens can be obtained in abundance (see Casey, 1950 : 272) and such specimens are represented in the principal museums, both in Britain and abroad. (*c*) It agrees with *D. mammillatum* as conceived by de Grossouvre, the founder of the genus *Douvilleiceras*. (*d*) It is the specimen selected to illustrate *D. mammillatum* by Roman in his monumental and widely-used Ammonite Synopsis (Roman 1938, pl. 43, fig. 411). (*e*) The specimen is extant, being preserved in the collections of the British Museum (Natural History) and is thus available for study by interested specialists.

12. The foregoing specimen is in the collections of the British Museum (Natural History). Affixed to the specimen are :—

number label " C 12491 "	— the official registration number of the specimen.
,, ,, " 2710 "	— a supplementary MS catalogue number of the late G. C. Crick.
green spot	— indicating figured specimen.

13. Accompanying the specimen are the following labels :—

(1) " L.G.S. or basement bed of Gault (zone of *Douvilleiceras mammillatum*) : Folkestone. F. G. H. Price coll. No. 17."

(2) " *Douvilleiceras mammillatum* (Schloth.), Albian. Basement bed of Gault. Zone of *Douvilleiceras mammillatum*. Folkestone, Kent. F. G. H. Price coll., purch. F. H. Butler, 26 Feby., 1910."

(3) " *Douvilleiceras mammillatum* (Schlotheim), Middle Albian (Lower Gault) Mammillatus Bed, Folkestone, Kent. Figd. Spath, 1923, Mon. Gault. Ammonites (Pal. Soc.), pt. 1, pl. iv, fig. 3. F. G. H. Price coll. 1910."

(4) " C 12491. Neotype—Casey."

14. The proposal which I now submit is therefore that the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should :—

(1) use its Plenary Powers :—

(*a*) to designate as the neotype of *Ammonites mammillatus* Schlotheim, 1813, the specimen figured by Spath in 1923, *A Monograph of the Gault Ammonoidea*, as figures 3a and 3b on plate 4 ;

1 7 ... 1954
PURCHASED

(*b*) to set aside all type selections for the genus *Douvilleiceras* de Grossouvre, 1893, made prior to the decision now to be taken and, having done so, to designate as the type species of that genus the nominal species *Ammonites mammillatus* Schlotheim, 1813, determined as in (*a*) above ;

(2) place the generic name *Douvilleiceras* de Grossouvre, 1893 (gender of generic name : neuter) (type species, by designation, as proposed under (1) (*b*) above, under the Plenary Powers : *Ammonites mammillatus* Schlotheim, 1813, determined, as proposed in (1) (*a*) above, under the Plenary Powers) on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology ;*

(3) place the specific name *mammillatus* Schlotheim, 1813, as published in the combination *Ammonites mammillatus*, as proposed, under (1) (*a*) above, to be interpreted under the Plenary Powers, on the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology ;*

(4) place the under-mentioned invalid emendations of the specific name *mammillatus* Schlotheim, 1813, as published in the combination *Ammonites mammillatus*, on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology :—*

(*a*) *mammillaris* d'Orbigny, 1841, as published in the combination *Ammonites mammillaris ;*

(*b*) *mamillaris* [sic] de Grossouvre, 1893, as published in the combination *Douvilleiceras mamillaris.*

References :

Breistroffer, M., 1947 : *Trav. Lab. geol. Grenoble*, **26,** 1-88.

Casey, R., 1950 : *Proc. geol. Assoc.*, **61**, 268-298.

—— 1951 : *Proc. geol. Assoc.*, **62**, 95-99.

Collignon, M., 1949 : *Ann. géol. Service des Mines* (Madagascar), fasc. **16.**

De Grossouvre, A., 1893 : *Mém. Expl. Carte géol. de France*, Les Ammonites de la Craie Supérieure.

D'Orbigny, A., 1840-41 : *Paléontologie française*. Terrains Crétacées. Céphaloposes.

Hyatt, A., 1903 : Pseudoceratites of the Cretaceous. *U.S. geol. Surv. Monograph.*

Parona, C. F., and Bonarelli, E. G., 1897 : *Pal. italica*, **2**, 53-112.

Roman, F., 1938 : *Les Ammonites jurassiques et crétacées*, Paris.

Schlotheim, E. F. von, 1813 : Min. Taschenbuch **7.**

Spath, L. F., 1923 : A Monograph of the Gault Ammonoidea. Pt. I, *Palaeont. Soc.*

Stoyanow, A., 1949 : *Mem. geol. Soc. America* **38.**

Walch, J. E., 1774 : Lithologische Beobachtungen. Erstes Stuck. (a) Vom Vervengang der Ammoniten. *Naturforscher*, **1**, 197-199.

Zittel, K. A., von, 1895 : Grundzüge der Palaeontologie.

CONTENTS

(*continued from front wrapper*)

New Applications

Page

A request for the use of the Plenary Powers to preserve the generic names in Geoffroy, 1762, in the Order Diptera (Class Insecta). By Dr. Alan Stone, Dr. C. W. Sabrosky, Dr. W. W. Wirth and Dr. R. H. Foote (*Division of Insect Detection and Identification, Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*) 241

Proposed use of the Plenary Powers to suppress *Palmatotriton* Smith, 1945 (Class Amphibia, Order Caudata). By Professor Hobart M. Smith (*Department of Zoology, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois, U.S.A.*) 247

Proposed use of the Plenary Powers to designate (i) a neotype for the nominal species *Ammonites mammillatus* Schlotheim, 1813, and (ii) a type species for the genus *Douvilleiceras* de Grossouvre, 1893 (Class Cephalopoda, Order Ammonoidea). By Mr. R. Casey (*Geological Survey and Museum, London*) 250

Comments on previously published applications

Meigen, 1800, *Nouvelle Classification des Mouches à deux Ailes* : Summary of Replies to a Questionnaire. By Dr. C. W. Sabrosky (*Division of Insect Detection and Identification, Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*) 225

Printed in Great Britain by Metchim and Son Ltd., Westminster, London

VOLUME 9. Part 9
pp. 255-286

25 OCT 1954
PURCHASED

22nd October 1954

THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

The Official Organ of

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Edited by

FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

CONTENTS:

Notices prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology :

Page

Date of commencement by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of voting on applications published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* 255

Notice of the possible use by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of its Plenary Powers in certain cases 256

(*continued inside back wrapper*)

LONDON :
Printed by Order of the International Trust for
Zoological Nomenclature
and
Sold on behalf of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
by the International Trust
at its Publications Office,
41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.
1954

Price Twelve Shillings and Sixpence

(*All rights reserved*)

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

A. The Officers of the Commission

Honorary Life President : Dr. Karl Jordan (*British Museum* (*Natural History*), *Zoological Museum, Tring, Herts., England*)

President : Professor James Chester Bradley (*Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*) (12th August 1953)

Vice-President : Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (*Sao Paulo, Brazil*) (12th August 1953)

Secretary : Mr. Francis Hemming (*London, England*) (27th July 1948)

B. The Members of the Commission

(*Arranged in order of precedence by reference to date of election or of most recent re-election, as prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology*)

Professor H. Boschma (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The Netherlands*) (1st January 1947)
Senor Dr. Angel Cabrera (*Eva Peron, F.C.N.G.R., Argentina*) (27th July 1948)
Mr. Francis Hemming (*London, England*) (27th July 1948) (*Secretary*)
Dr. Joseph Pearson (*Tasmanian Museum, Hobart, Tasmania, Australia*) (27th July 1948)
Dr. Henning Lemche (*Universitetets Zoologiske Museum, Copenhagen, Denmark*) (27th July 1948)
Professor Teiso Esaki (*Kyushu University, Fukuoka, Japan*) (17th April 1950)
Professor Pierre Bonnet (*Université de Toulouse, France*) (9th June 1950)
Mr. Norman Denbigh Riley (*British Museum* (*Natural History*) *London*) (9th June 1950)
Professor Tadeusz Jaczewski (*Institute of Zoology, Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw, Poland*) (15th June 1950)
Professor Robert Mertens (*Natur-Museum u. Forschungs-Institut Senckenberg, Frankfurt a. M., Germany*) (5th July 1950)
Professor Erich Martin Hering (*Zoologisches Museum der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Germany*) (5th July 1950)
Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (*S. Paulo, Brazil*) (12th August 1953) (*Vice-President*)
Professor J. R. Dymond (*University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada*) (12th August 1953)
Professor J. Chester Bradley (*Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*) (12th August 1953) (*President*)
Professor Harold E. Vokes (*Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, U.S.A.*) (12th August 1953)
Professor Béla Hankó (*Mezőgazdasági Muzeum, Budapest, Hungary*) (12th August 1953)
Dr. Norman R. Stoll (*Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, New York, N.Y., U.S.A.*) (12th August 1953)
Mr. P. C. Sylvester-Bradley (*Sheffield University, Sheffield, England*) (12th August 1953)
Dr. L. B. Holthuis (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The Netherlands*) (12th August 1953)

BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Volume 9, Part 9 (pp. 255-286) 22nd October 1954

NOTICES PRESCRIBED BY THE INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ZOOLOGY

The following notices are given in pursuance of decisions taken, on the recommendation of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 51–56, 57–59), by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, July 1948 (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **5** : 5–13, 131).

(a) Date of commencement by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of voting on applications published in the " Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature "

Notice is hereby given that normally the International Commission may start to vote upon applications published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* on the expiry of a period of six calendar months from the date of publication in the *Bulletin* of the applications in question. Any specialist who may desire to comment upon any of the applications published in the present Part (Vol. 9, Part 9) of the *Bulletin* is accordingly invited to do so in writing to the Secretary to the Commission, as quickly as possible and in any case, in sufficient time to enable the communication in question to reach the Secretariat of the Commission before the expiry of the six-month period referred to above.

Notices prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology (*continued*)

(b) Notice of the possible use by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of its Plenary Powers in certain cases

1. Notice is hereby given that the possible use by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of its Plenary Powers is involved in applications published in the present Part of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* in relation to the following names :—

(1) *Discoides ; Cerebratulus ; Polycitor ; Scolixedion ;* all being generic names in Renier [1804] *Prospetto* (now rejected for nomenclatorial purposes), question of validation of (Z.N.(S.)832) ;

(2) *Aglaja ; Alcyonaria ; Cystia ; Rodens ; Tuba ; Tubulanus ;* all being generic names in Renier [1807] *Tavola* (now proposed to be rejected for nomenclatorial purposes), question of validation of (Z.N.(S.)688) ;

(3) Names (generic and specific) given to aptychi of Ammonites, proposed suppression of (Z.N.(S.)589) ;

(4) *Notropis* Rafinesque, 1818 (Cl. Osteichthyes, Order Cyprinida), proposed determination as of masculine gender of (Z.N.(S.)663) ;

(5) *Cheloniceras* Hyatt, 1903 (Cl. Cephalopoda, Order Ammonoidea), proposed designation of type species for, in harmony with accustomed nomenclatorial usage (Z.N.(S.)703) ;

(6) *Argus* Bohadsch, 1761 (Cl. Gastropoda), proposed retention of status for the purposes of the Law of Homonymy (Z.N.(S.)714) ;

(7) *minimus* Miller (J. S.), 1826, as published in the combination *Belemnites minimus* (Cl. Cephalopoda, Order Dibranchia), proposed validation of (Z.N.(S.)823).

2. Attention is drawn also to a request published in the present Part for the adoption of a *Declaration* that a generic or specific name based solely upon the "aptychus" of an ammonite be excluded from availability under Article 27 of the *Règles* (Z.N.(S.)589).

3. Comments received in sufficient time will be published in the *Bulletin :* other comments, provided that they are received within the prescribed period of six calendar months from the date of publication of the present Part, will be laid before the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at the time of commencement of voting on the application concerned.

4. In accordance with the arrangement agreed upon at the Session held by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in Paris in 1948 (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 56) corresponding Notices have been sent to the serial publications *Nature* and *Science.*

FRANCIS HEMMING,
Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

28 Park Village East, Regent's Park,
London, N.W.1, England.

22nd October 1954

APPLICATION FOR A RULING THAT WORKS CREDITED TO S. A. RENIER AS OF THE DATES 1804 AND 1807 WERE NOT PUBLISHED WITHIN THE MEANING OF ARTICLE 25 OF THE "RÈGLES"

By A. MYRA KEEN
(*Stanford University, Stanford, California, U.S.A.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)688)

In a recent petition Dr. L. R. Cox (Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)432)[1] asks that "the *Prodromo* of S. A. Renier and the *Prospetto della Classe dei Vermi* (dated 1804) prepared by that author for inclusion in the *Prodromo*" be rejected as not having been duly published.

2. The present petition requests that the Commission consider the larger problem of all of Renier's uncompleted works dated 1804 and 1807. As Dr. Cox's petition did not take into account the generic and specific names involved, it seems well to review these in some detail.

3. The term "Prodromo" apparently was used only informally if at all by Renier, for the word does not appear in the photostatic copy of Renier's works now in Stanford University library, a copy formerly owned by C. D. Sherborn. In his *Index animalium* (sect. 2, vol. 1, 1922), Sherborn cites the titles of these works thus :

Prodr. osserv. Venezia 1804-7 (not published except as the three following) :
Tavola alfab. Conch. Adriat. 1804.
Prosp. classe dei Vermi. 1804.
Compendium di Zoologia (does not exist except as the following) :
Tavola per serve. conosc. classif. Anim. 1807 ; (Ed. 2, 1820, quoted by Meneghini in Oss. post. 1847, 114).

The *Nomenclator Animalium Generum et Subgenerum* of Schulze, Kükenthal, and Heider (vol. 1, 1926) cites these titles somewhat differently :

Tavola Alfabetica delle Conchiglie Adriatiche nominate dietro il sistema di Linneo, Edizione di Gmelin. Padua, 1788.
Prodromo di Osservazioni sopra alcuni Esseri viventi della Classe dei Vermi abitanti nell' Adriatico, nelle Lagune e Litorali Veneti—Prospetto della Classe dei Vermi. Padua, 1804.
Tavole per servire alla classificazione e connoscenza degle animali. Padua, 1807.

4. The only contemporary mention of Renier's work I have found is by G. B. Brocchi (1814, *Conchiologia fossile Subappennina* **1** : 55 [free translation]) :

> . . . Signor Renieri, professor of natural history at the University of Padua, having been engaged for several years in the study of the organisms of the Adriatic, has provided me the opportunity of consulting the very rich series of shells which he collected in this sea and on which he published the Catalogue in 1804. . .

Brocchi's book, published in Milan (not far from Padua), had wide circulation in Europe, and hence it carried some of Renier's zoological names with it. Save for citations from Brocchi, I find no further mention of Renier's early papers until 1847 when in another nearby Italian city, Venice, two authors, Meneghini and Nardo, published works based on Renier's manuscripts. As I have not been able to consult these, I quote the titles from Engelmann (*Bibliotheca zool.*, Bd. **1,** 1861 : 273-4) :

---

[1] A decision has now been taken on Dr. Cox's application (1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **2** : 299-300) and has been embodied in *Opinion* 316, which it is hoped to publish at an early date.

> Renier, St. A., Osservazioni postumi di zoologia Adriatica, pubblicati per cura dell' I. R. Istituto Veneto di scienze, lettere ed arti a studio del Prof. Meneghini. Con 16 tavole color, e 16 tavole nere. Venezia . . . 1847. Fol. In 100 Exemplaren gedrückt.
>
> Nardo, Giov. Domin., Fauna marina volgare del Veneto estuario. Venezia, 1847. 8.
>
> —— Prospetto della Fauna marina del Veneto Estuario. Venezia, 1847. 8.

Hence, the date of validation of most of Renier's zoological names would seem to be 1847. One may question whether even Brocchi considered the names to have been published, for he cited no page references for the names of the species that he attributed to Renier, in marked contrast to the careful documentation given the names of species described by previous authors.

5. Renier's first work, the "*Tavola alfabetica* . . ." is assigned the date 1788 by Engelmann (*op. cit.* : 831) and by Schulze, Kükenthal, and Heider. This is manifestly incorrect, for the sections of Gmelin's edition of *Systema Naturae* to which it refers did not appear until 1790. In this *Tavola*, which consists of plates numbered 1 to 13, no new generic names were proposed, but Renier credited to himself many new trivial names, with footnote discussions. Although most of his descriptions are inadequate, references to previously published figures document a number of names. Fortunately, most of the figures had already been acceptably named by other authors. At least three of Renier's specific names, however, still crop up occasionally in lists—*Tellina serrata*, *Solecurtus candidus*, and *Eulima incurva*. The first two are absolute *nomina nuda* in the *Tavola*. *Tellina serrata* was validated by Brocchi, 1814, and should be attributed to him. For *Solecurtus candidus* (*Solen candidus* Renier) the synonym *S. scopula* Turton, 1822 has been adopted by Winckworth (1932, *J. Conch.* **19** : 246). Winckworth credited *Eulima incurva* (*Helix incurva* Renier, based on two published figures) to Bucquoy, Dautzenberg, and Dollfus, 1893, though one would wonder whether it may not have been validated earlier by Meneghini or Nardo. Some 40 other of Renier's specific names are listed by Bucquoy, Dautzenberg and Dollfus (1882-1898, *Mollusques Marins du Roussillon*) as synonyms. Hence, none of the names in the *Tavola alfab.* seems in need of conservation.

6. The pages of the *Prospetto della Classe dei Vermi* . . . are numbered as plates 15 to 26. Several new generic and trivial names are proposed :

Discoides (sole species, *D. nutans* Renier, briefly described).

Polycitor (based on four species of which two are previously described, *Alcyonium schlosseri* Pallas, 1766, and *A. conicum* Olivi, 1792, renamed by Renier).

Scolixedion (sole species *S. penulatum* Renier =*Serpula arenaria* Linnaeus, 1758).

Cerebratulus (based on two species, *C. bilineatus* Renier and *C. marginatus* Renier, both briefly described).

Aglaia (sic), *Rodens*, *Tricoelia* (sic), *Tubulanus* (*nomina nuda*).

7. As I have shown elsewhere (1951, *Nautilus* **65** (No. 1) : 8-15), the third work of Renier, the " Tavole," consists of eight synoptic tables covering five of the eleven classes into which he divided the animal kingdom. Names credited by Renier to himself appear in four of the tables :

Alcyonaria (based on *Alcyonium palmatum* Pallas, 1766, and *A. digitatum* Linnaeus, 1758).

Acicula (sole species, *A. macula* Renier, briefly described).

Rodens (sole species, *R. armillatus* Renier, briefly described).

Tricelia (sole species, *T. variopadata* Renier, briefly described).

Tuba (sole species, *T. divisa* Renier, briefly described).

Tubulanus (sole species, *T. polymorphus* Renier, briefly described).

Cystia (based on two species, *C. nivea* Renier, undescribed, and *Ostrea bullata* Born, 1778).

Arenaria (homonym of *Arenaria* Brisson, 1760).

Aglaja (based on two species, *A. depicta* Renier and *A. tricolorata* Renier, both described).

Discoides (sole species, *D. nutans* Renier, briefly described).

Cerebratulus, *Marginella*, *Imisia*, *Scolixedion* (*nomina nuda*).

8. Had these unfinished works of Renier been validly published in the years 1804 and 1807, the following generic names would be available for use : *Acicula* (1807), *Aglaja* (1807), *Alcyonaria* (1804), *Cerebratulus* (1804), *Cystia* (1807), *Discoides* (1807), *Polycitor* (1804), *Rodens* (1807), *Scolixedion* (1804), *Tricelia* (1807), *Tuba* (1807), and *Tubulanus* (1807). The question arises, how many have found their way into the literature ? Of the names that fall within Mollusca—*Aglaja*, *Cystia*, *Discoides*, and *Scolixedion*—only *Aglaja* is in use, type genus of the family AGLAJIDAE (Gastropoda, Opisthobranchiata). It was adopted by Pilsbry in 1895 on the assumption, from the testimony of Meneghini, 1847, that it had priority over the long used *Doridium* Meckel, 1809. One may note that more specific names have been proposed under *Doridium* than under *Aglaja*, but readoption of *Doridium* might cause some confusion, as the family name DORIDIIDAE Bergh, 1893, is regrettably similar to DORIDIDAE, name of another family of Opisthobranchiata (type genus, *Doris*). Rejection of *Aglaja* Renier might also have repercussions in other fields of zoology, for there is an *Aglaja* Eschscholtz, 1825 in Coelenterata and *Aglaia* Swainson, 1827, in Aves (*fide* Sherborn). The question of conserving the name *Aglaja* is here left open for the expression of opinion by interested persons. *Discoides* is a *nomen dubium*, usually regarded as a synonym of *Pleurobranchus* Cuvier, 1804. *Cystia*, if validated, would displace *Limatula* Wood, 1839, and *Scolixedion* would displace *Serpulorbis* Sassi, 1827. In Mollusca, then, only *Aglaja* might justifiably be made a *nomen conservandum*. Regarding other Phyla, I have thus far consulted only Dr. Olga Hartman, specialist in Annelida. She informs me that *Tricelia* is considered a synonym of *Chaetopterus* [Cuvier, 1830] and that *Cerebratulus* is in use in Nemertea. According to Bronn's *Classen und Ordnungen des Thier-Reichs*, *Tubulanus* is also a genus of Nemertea, type of the family TUBULANIDAE. I have no information on the present status of *Acicula*, *Alcyonaria*, *Polycitor*, *Rodens*, and *Tuba*. If they are in use, specialists may wish to petition for their preservation. The generic name *Alcyonaria* Renier seems to have been overlooked by most nomenclators. It is not the Alcyonaria of Milne-Edwards, a subclass of Coelenterata.

9. There is in the " Tavole," 1807, a further problem of dual nomenclature for molluscan genera. A sample entry is here quoted :

Nome generico dei Molluschi	Nome generico delle conchiglie	Nome specifico di alcuni conchiglie
3. *Fistulanigenus*	*Fistulana* Lam.	*Ter. clava* Gmel.

Thus, the names in Renier's first column are compounded from the names in the second (the standard list of his day) by addition of the suffix-*genus* to denote the soft parts or the animal that resides in the shell. Perhaps these terms could be dismissed under *Opinion* 72 as formulae, not true zoological names. Although they have been cited as available names by modern nomenclators, none has yet been adopted, so far as I can discover, and none would seem to serve a useful purpose. (It may be remarked that several of these refer to groups that would not now be placed in Mollusca.) The following note explains the nature of Renier's plates VII and VIII and the method used by him for numbering the terms which he employed :—

> Renier's Tavole VII and VIII are really analytical charts, with descriptive text at the top and left side to group the organisms in morphologic categories. At the right were the series of columns described in my petition, listing common name, latin name, name of shell, name of animal, etc. The numerical arrangement began with an overall column followed immediately by a second which tallied all the genera in one of his selected morphologic categories. Major breaks in continuity in the second column here were caused by insertion, from time to time, of a group of " naked " mollusks among those that were " shelled." Thus, in Tav. VII, the numbers run concurrently to 5, these being soft-bodied groups, then the shelled ones begin at 1 in the second column, opposite 6 in the first. I would not need to mention this complication except that if the Commission wishes to list the names by number and uses only the second column, there would appear to be two number 8's, one opposite 13 of Tav. VII, the other opposite 95 of Tav. VIII. In making this transcript I have included several names to show you the system that should be omitted in the final version. These I have signalized by asterisks. It may be you will choose to use the numbers in the first column. In this case the numeration would begin at 6 and would omit 83, 94, and 96 as well as 152-160. But if you choose to use both or to use the set that is nearest to the generic names in question, some explanation will have to be given for the breaks in sequence between 87-88 and after 142.

10. The following is a complete list of the names ending in *genus*, in the order given by Renier :—

Tav. VII—MOLLUSCHI

*1.	1.	Mammaria
*2.	2.	Pyrosoma Peron
*3.	3.	Salpa
*4.	4.	Polycitor
*5.	5.	Ascidia
6.	1.	Teredigenus
7.	2.	Pholadigenus
8.	3.	Fistulanigenus
9.	4.	Saxicavigenus
10.	5.	Rupellarigenus
11.	6.	Petricoligenus
12.	7.	Solenigenus
13.	8.	Sanguinolarigenus
14.	9.	Glycimerigenus
15.	10.	Myigenus
16.	11.	Panopeigenus
17.	12.	Anatinigenus
18.	13.	Mactrigenus
19.	14.	Lutrarigenus
20.	15.	Crassatelligenus
21.	16.	Ungulinigenus
22.	17.	Tellinigenus
23.	18.	Donacigenus
24.	19.	Cytherigenus

25.	20.	Venerigenus
26.	21.	Erycinigenus
27.	22.	Capsigenus
28.	23.	Galateigenus
29.	24.	Cycladigenus
30.	25.	Lucinigenus
31.	26.	Venericardigenus
32.	27.	Cardigenus
33.	28.	Isocardigenus
34.	29.	Carditigenus
35.	30.	Hippopigenus
36.	31.	Tridacnigenus
37.	32.	Trigonigenus
38.	33.	Cucullaeigenus
39.	34.	Archigenus
40.	35.	Pectunculigenus
41.	36.	Nuculigenus
42.	37.	Anodontigenus
43.	38.	Uniigenus
44.	39.	Pandorigenus
45.	40.	Corbuligenus
46.	41.	Diceratigenus
47.	42.	Chamigenus
48.	43.	Etheriigenus
49.	44.	Hirundigenus
50.	45.	Malleigenus
51.	46.	Pernigenus
52.	47.	Crenatuligenus
53.	48.	Mytiligenus
54.	49.	Modioligenus
55.	50.	Pinnigenus
56.	51.	Plancunigenus [sic]
57.	52.	Marginelligenus
58.	53.	Limigenus
59.	54.	Pedigenus
60.	55.	Cystigenus
61.	56.	Imisigenus
62.	57.	Pectinigenus
63.	58.	Spondyligenus
64.	59.	Plicatuligenus
65.	60.	Gryphaeigenus
66.	61.	Ostreigenus
67.	62.	Vulselligenus
68.	63.	Anomigenus
69.	64.	Creniigenus
70.	65.	Calceoligenus
71.	66.	Radiolithigenus
72.	67.	Orbiculigenus
73.	68.	Terebratuligenus
74.	69.	Liguligenus
75.	70.	Anatifigenus
76.	71.	Balanigenus
77.	72.	Tubicinelligenus
78.	73.	Coronuligenus

Tav. VIII—MOLLUSCHI

79.	74.	Aspergilligenus
80.	75.	Siliquarigenus
81.	76.	Vermicularigenus
82.	77.	Arenarigenus Scolixedion
*83.	6.	Phyllidia
84.	78.	Patelligenus
85.	79.	Fissurelligenus
86.	80.	Emarginuligenus
87.	81.	Crepiduligenus
88.	82.	Calyptraeigenus
89.	83.	Stomatiigenus
90.	84.	Haliotidigenus
91.	85.	Concolepadigenus
92.	86.	Planospirigenus
93.	87.	Chitonigenus
*94.	7.	Parmacella
*95.	8.	Testacelligenus
*96.	9.	Limax
97.	88.	Natichigenus
98.	89.	Neritinigenus
99.	90.	Helicinigenus
100.	91.	Helicigenus
101.	92.	Planorbigenus
102.	93.	Ampullarigenus
103.	94.	Auriculigenus
104.	95.	Pyramidelligenus
105.	96.	Melanigenus
106.	97.	Lymneigenus
107.	98.	Achatinigenus
108.	99.	Phasianelligenus
109.	100.	Volvarigenus
110.	101.	Bulimigenus
111.	102.	Amphibulimigenus
112.	103.	Ianthinigenus
113.	104.	Turritelligenus
114.	105.	Pupigenus
115.	106.	Scalarigenus
116.	107.	Cyclostomigenus
117.	108.	Monodontigenus
118.	109.	Delphinuligenus
119.	110.	Turbinigenus
120.	111.	Solarigenus
121.	112.	Trochigenus
122.	113.	Cerithiigenus
123.	114.	Clavatuligenus
124.	115.	Pleurotomigenus
125.	116.	Turbinelligenus
126.	117.	Fasciolarigenus
127.	118.	Pyruligenus
128.	119.	Fusigenus
129.	120.	Muricigenus
130.	121.	Rostellariigenus
131.	122.	Pterocerigenus
132.	123.	Strombigenus
133.	124.	Cassigenus
134.	125.	Harpigenus
135.	126.	Doliigenus
136.	127.	Terebrigenus
137.	128.	Eburnigenus
138.	129.	Buccinigenus
139.	130.	Purpurigenus
140.	131.	Nassigenus
141.	132.	Cancellarigenus
142.	133.	Marginelligenus
143.	134.	Columbelligenus
144.	135.	Mitrigenus
145.	136.	Volutigenus
146.	137.	Ancilligenus
147.	148.	Olivigenus
148.	139.	Terebelligenus
149.	140.	Ovuligenus
150.	141.	Cypraeigenus
151.	142.	Conigenus
161.	18.	Sigaretigenus
162.	19.	Bulligenus

11. I concur with Dr. Cox in the belief that these papers of Renier's are "fragments of a work contemplated but never published." The lack of an over-all title page, the preservation of only a single known copy of the works, at the library of the University of Padua, the lack of agreement among bibliographers as to exact titles and dates, and the omission of Renier's generic names from nomenclators such as Agassiz (1842-46) and Herrmannsen (1846-49) [the name *Aglaia* is listed in the supplement to the latter (1852) as, "Renier (?1804)"], all suggest that prior to 1847 Renier's works above discussed existed only as proof-sheets or as charts set up in type for class-room use.

12. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is now asked to take the following action supplementary to the action in regard to the *Tavola alfabetica delle Conchiglie Adriatiche* and the *Prospetto della Classe dei Vermi* prepared by Renier (S.A.) and commonly attributed to the year "1804" recommended in the application already submitted by Dr. L. R. Cox, namely that it should :

(1) rule that the work by Renier (S.A.) entitled *Tavole per servire alla classificazione e connescenza degli Animali* and commonly attributed to the year "1807" was not published within the meaning of Article 25 of the *Règles* and therefore that no name acquired the status of availability by reason of appearing in the foregoing work ;

(2) place the work specified in (1) above on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Works in Zoological Nomenclature* ;

(3) provide an opportunity to specialists to submit applications for the validation, under the Plenary Powers, of any of the undermentioned generic names which may be shown to be in current use ;
   (*a*) Names which first appeared in the *Prospetto* of 1804 :
      (i) *Discoides* Renier ;
      (ii) *Cerebratulus* Renier ;
      (iii) *Polycitor* Renier ;
      (iv) *Scolixedion* Renier ;
   (*b*) Names which first appeared in the *Tavole* of 1807 :
      (i) *Aglaja* Renier ;
      (ii) *Alcyonaria* Renier ;
      (iii) *Cystia* Renier ;
      (iv) *Rodens* Renier ;
      (v) *Tricelia* Renier ;
      (vi) *Tuba* Renier ;
      (vii) *Tubulanus* Renier ;

(4) place on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* :
   (*a*) any of the names enumerated in (3) above which are not validated under the Plenary Powers in response to the appeal there suggested ;
   (*b*) the generic names having the termination "-genus" listed in paragraph 10 of the present application (unless this is considered impracticable, in which case a Ruling that these words are formulae and not zoological names is asked for) ;

(5) place on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* the specific names enumerated in paragraphs 5, 6, and 7 of the present application as names newly-proposed by Renier in the works there specified.

QUESTION WHETHER IT IS DESIRABLE IN THE INTERESTS OF NOMENCLATORIAL STABILITY TO VALIDATE UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS CERTAIN GENERIC NAMES AS FROM RENIER, [1804], "PROSPETTO," CONSEQUENT UPON THE REJECTION OF THAT WORK FOR NOMENCLATORIAL PURPOSES

By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.
(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)832)

At the time when Dr. Myra Keen submitted her application asking for the rejection, as being unpublished, of certain works by Renier commonly attributed to the years " 1804 " and " 1807," she proposed that, concurrently with the rejection of these works, specialists should be given an opportunity to ask for the validation of certain generic names, in the event of their considering that this should be done in the interests of nomenclatorial stability.

2. One of the works covered by Dr. Keen's application was the *Prospetto* of 1804, an application for the rejection of which had, as she pointed out, already been submitted by Dr. L. R. Cox (1951, *Bull. Zool. Nomencl.* **2** : 299-300). Since then, Dr. Cox's application has been approved by the Commission and the decision so taken has been embodied in *Opinion* 316 (now in the press).

3. Four of the names referred to by Dr. Keen first appeared in the *Prospetto* and under the foregoing decision are now invalid, as from Renier [1804]. These names are : *Discoides* Renier ; *Cerebratulus* Renier ; *Polycitor* Renier ; *Scolixedion* Renier.

4. Acting on Dr. Keen's suggestion, I am now giving notice of the possible use of the Plenary Powers to validate the foregoing names, and I appeal to interested specialists to inform the Commission whether they consider that any of these names should be so validated. Any of the names not so validated will in six month's time be placed on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* under the regulations governing that *Index*.

QUESTION OF VALIDATING CERTAIN GENERIC NAMES, UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS, IN THE INTERESTS OF NOMENCLATORIAL STABILITY AS FROM RENIER, [1807], " TAVOLA," IN THE EVENT OF THE REJECTION OF THAT WORK FOR NOMENCLATORIAL PURPOSES

By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.
(Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)688)

Dr. Myra Keen's application in regard to the works of Renier (:257-262) raises a situation in relation to new generic names in the *Tavola* of Renier of 1807 exactly parallel to that discussed in the immediately preceding note in relation to the *Prospetto* of the same author, except that the latter work has already been rejected by the Commission, while no decision will be taken for six months in the case of the *Tavola.*

2. The generic names which first appeared in the *Tavola* and as regards which Dr. Keen has suggested that specialists should be given an opportunity to state whether they desire validation under the Plenary Powers as from Renier [1807] are (1) *Aglaja* Renier ; (2) *Alcyonaria* Renier ; (3) *Cystia* Renier ; (4) *Rodens* Renier ; (5) *Tuba* Renier ; (6) *Tubulanus* Renier.

3. Specialists are invited to inform the Commission whether they consider that any of the foregoing names ought to be validated in the interests of stability in nomenclature. Any name not validated in response to the foregoing appeal for advice will, at the expiry of a period of six months, be placed on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology.* Notice of the possible use of the Plenary Powers in respect of these names is being given in the prescribed manner.

SUPPLEMENTARY APPLICATION CONCERNING THE SUPPRESSION OF WORKS BY S. A. RENIER (1804 AND 1807)

By L. R. COX, M.A., Sc.D., F.R.S.
(*British Museum* (*Natural History*), *London*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)688)

An application for a ruling that the *Prodromo* and *Prospetto della Classe dei Vermi* of S. A. Renier (1804) should not rank as publications within the meaning of Article 25 has been submitted by the present applicant (1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **2** : 299).

2. It was made clear that the application relating to the *Prodromo* covered the section entitled *Tavola alfabetica delle Conchiglie Adriatiche.* It is now proposed to extend the application to the same author's work said to have been entitled *Tavole per servire alla classificazione e connoscenza degle animali* and to have been published in 1807. (The title page is wanting in the only extant copy.)

3. The statements made in the previous application concerning the doubtful status of Renier's works as publications apply also to this last work. It is known only by a single printed copy in the library of the University of Padua and by two reduced photographic reproductions made for C. D. Sherborn. One reproduction is in the British Museum (Natural History), while the second has recently been acquired by the library of Stanford University, California. It is most improbable that this work was ever generally distributed. It consists of eight tables containing the outlines of schemes of classification, and in them a number of new generic and specific names are introduced.

4. The nomenclatural problems raised by the 1807 work have been discussed by Dr. A. Myra Keen (1951, *Nautilus*, **65** : 8) in so far as they affect the mollusca. Renier introduced a scheme in which the soft parts received a distinct generic name ending in " *-genus*," derived from that of the shell (e.g. *Teredigenus*, derived from *Teredo*). Miss Keen states that " I do not agree that these names ending in *-genus* are either validly proposed or valid emendations," and her final conclusion is that " Renier's contributions to molluscan taxonomy can be reduced to four generic names, only one of which, *Aglaja*, is in current use. Two, *Scolixedion* and *Cystia*, will displace familiar names unless suppressed by action of the International Commission or unless it can be shown that the type species are *species dubia*. The fourth, *Discoides*, remains for specialists in Opisthobranchiata to evaluate."

5. The generic name *Aglaja* Renier, which appeared both in his " Prospetto . . . Vermi " (1804) and his " Tavole . . . animali " (1807 ?) has latterly been used for the genus formerly known generally as *Doridium* Meckel, 1809, type genus of a family DORIDIIDAE. A reversion to this name *Doridium* would not create confusion, for it is used for the genus in such standard works as P. Fischer's " Manuel de Conchyliologie " (1880-87) and A. H. Cooke's " Molluscs " (*Cambridge Natural History*, 1895).

PROPOSED ADOPTION OF A "DECLARATION" THAT A GENERIC OR SPECIFIC NAME BASED SOLELY UPON THE "APTYCHUS" OF AN AMMONITE (CLASS CEPHALOPODA, ORDER AMMONOIDEA) BE EXCLUDED FROM AVAILABILITY UNDER ARTICLE 27 OF THE "RÈGLES" AND PROPOSED SUPPRESSION OF CERTAIN SUCH NAMES UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS

By W. J. ARKELL, M.A., D.Sc., F.R.S.
(*Cambridge University, Sedgwick Museum, Cambridge*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)589 (proposed "Declaration"); Z.N.(S.)858 ("Official Lists" and "Official Indexes"))

Sub-section (*a*) of Article 27 of the *Règles* provides that "the oldest available name is retained when any part of an animal is named before the animal itself." The present application seeks a clarification of this provision in one particular.

2. Many nominal genera are based upon nominal species of which the type specimens are incomplete. The foregoing rule is therefore, in general, desirable.

3. There are however certain special cases where the application of the above rule would lead to highly undesirable disturbance of existing nomenclature. Such cases can be dealt with either by the insertion of words in Article 27 ruling out from availability names based exclusively upon some specified part of an animal or can be eliminated individually by the names concerned being suppressed by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature under its Plenary Powers, the names so suppressed being then placed on the appropriate *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Names in Zoology*.

4. An example of the undesirable disturbance of existing nomenclature which would arise from the strict application of Sub-section (*a*) of Article 27 is provided by the names bestowed upon the aptychi of ammonites, structures which are now generally admitted to be opercula, analogous with those of gastropods. In the first half of the XIXth century, the nature of these structures was not understood, and several nominal genera and nominal species were established for them in the belief, usually, that they were lammellibranchs. Subsequently, some of these opercula have been found *in situ* in the body-chamber of ammonites. In these cases the names currently used for the genera and species of ammonite concerned were not published until long after the names published for their aptychi. The names published for the aptychi being at present available names, there is a serious risk of disturbance in current nomenclatorial practice unless the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature takes preventive action.

5. One of the oldest nominal genera based upon aptychi is *Trigonellites* Parkinson, 1811 (*Organic Remains former World* : 184), for which a description and good figures were provided by Parkinson. No type species was designated for this genus, the type species of which must however be one or other of the two originally included nominal species, *Trigonellites latus* Parkinson, 1811 (: 186, pl. 13, figs. 9, 12) and *T. lamellosus* Parkinson, 1811 (: 186, pl. 13, figs. 10, 11). Since Parkinson's time, the nominal species *T. latus* has been identified as having been based upon the aptychus of a species of the genus *Aspidoceras* Zittel, 1868, and *T. lamellosus* as having been based upon a species of the genus *Oppelia* Waagen, 1869. Thus, whichever of the foregoing species were to be selected as the type species of the nominal genus *Trigonellites* Parkinson, a serious situation would arise, for in the one case the name *Trigonellites* Parkinson would replace the name *Aspidoceras* Zittel, while in the other case that name would replace *Oppelia* Waagen. These are both important genera and are the type genera of families ; the supersession of either of these names would give rise to confusion and would be open to strong objection. It is the object of the present application to prevent these and other names in current use from being invalidated by the resuscitation of these old names based upon aptychi. In the present case it is desirable that, as part of its decision in regard to the name *Trigonellites* Parkinson, the International Commission should place the name *Aspidoceras* Zittel on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*. In the case of *Oppelia* Waagen, 1869, a proposal for its addition to the *Official List* has already been submitted to the International Commission (1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **2** (6–8) : 227) and no further action is therefore needed here[2]. It may be noted that Dr. F. Trauth (Vienna), the sole world authority on aptychi, does not recognise as an available name any generic name or specific name based solely upon the aptychi of ammonites. See Trauth, F., 1927–1936, Aptychenstudien I–VIII (*Ann. naturh. Mus. Wien* **41-48**) (especially " Aptychenstudien I ", published in 1927 (*loc. cit.* **41** : 221–228)). It will be seen therefore that the action now recommended is in line with current usage both from the point of view of the study of ammonites and from that of the study of aptychi.

6. It is accordingly recommended that the International Commission should render a " Declaration " recommending the International Congress of Zoology to amend Article 27 of the *Règles* in such a way as to deprive of availability in zoological nomenclature any name based solely upon the aptychus of an ammonite.

7. The amendment of the *Règles* in the foregoing sense would completely dispose of the problem here under consideration, but in the nature of the case this is a remedy which cannot be secured until the suggested " Declaration " is reported to, and approved by, the next International Congress of Zoology. It would however be most undesirable that the particular names with which we are here concerned should be permitted to retain their present status until the next Congress, for, as matters now stand, it would otherwise be necessary to take account of them in the forthcoming *Treatise on Invertebrate Paleontology*. It is therefore recommended that the immediate situation should be dealt with by the suppression of these names by the International Commission under its Plenary Powers, the names in question, when so suppressed, being placed on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology*.

---

[2] This name has now been placed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* in *Opinion* 311 (in the press).

8. The proposals which are now specifically submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature are that it should :—

(1) render a " Declaration " recommending that Sub-Section (*a*) of Article 27 be amended by the addition of the following words excluding from its scope anygeneric name or specific name based solely upon the aptychus of an ammonite : " save that, where a nominal genus or nominal species of ammonites (Class Cephalopoda, Order Ammonoidea) has been established solely upon an aptychus or upon aptychi, the generic name or, as the case may be, the specific name published for the nominal genus or nominal species so established is to have no status in zoological nomenclature " ;

(2) in anticipation of the insertion in the *Règles* of the foregoing amendment of Article 27, use its Plenary Powers to suppress the under-mentioned names of generic and specific names of species, each of which is based solely upon the aptychus, or upon the aptychi, of ammonites :—

(*a*) the under-mentioned generic names :—

(i) *Trigonellites* Parkinson, 1811, *Organic Remains former World* **3** : 184 ;
(ii) *Solennites* Schlotheim, 1813, *Tasch. Min.* : 105 ;
(iii) *Solenites* Schlotheim, 1820, *Petref.* : 180 (an emendation of *Solennites* Schlotheim, 1813) ;
(iv) *Aptychus* Meyer, 1831, *Jahrb. f. Min.* 1831 : 393 ; *id.*, 1831, *N. Acta Acad. Caes. Leopold. Car.* **15** (No. 2) : 125 ;
(v) *Aptycus* Deshayes, 1845, *in* Lamarck, *Hist. Anim. sans Vertèbr.* (ed. 2) **11** : 228 (an emendation of *Aptychus* Meyer, 1831) ;
(vi) *Muensteria* Eudes-Deslongchamps, 1835, *Mém. Soc. linn. Normandie* **5** : 61 ;

(*b*) the under-mentioned specific names :—

(i) *lamellosus* Parkinson, 1811, as published in the binominal combination *Trigonellites lamellosus* ;
(ii) *latus* Parkinson, 1811, as published in the binominal combination *Trigonellites latus* ;

(3) place the six generic names proposed, under (2) (*a*) above, to be suppressed under the Plenary Powers, on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology :*

(4) place the two specific names proposed, under (2) (*b*) above, to be suppressed under the Plenary Powers on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology ;*

(5) place the generic name *Aspidoceras* Zittel, 1868 (*Pal. Mitt. Mus. Bayer.* **2** (Abt. 1) : 116) (gender of generic name : neuter) (type species, by monotypy : *Ammonites rogoznikensis* Zeuschner, 1868 (*in* Zittel, *Pal. Mitt. Mus. Bayer.* **2** (Abt. 1) : 116, pl. 24, fig. 5) on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology :*

(6) place the specific name *rogoznikensis* Zeuschner, 1868, as published in the combination *Ammonites rogoznikensis* (specific name of type species of *Aspidoceras* Zittel, 1868) on the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology*.

COMMENT ON THE TYPE SPECIES OF "ANCILLA" LAMARCK, 1799 (CLASS GASTROPODA)

By KATHERINE V. W. PALMER
(*Palæontological Research Institution, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)170)

(Reference to proposal submitted by Mr. Francis Hemming in the note published on pages 219-220 of the present volume)

Thank you for your letter and note regarding *Ancilla* Lamarck, 1799. The procedure in designating the type species by monotypy of *Ancilla* Lamarck, 1799, seems to be straight according to the recommendation of the Paris Congress and I see no objection to the procedure in that it gives a monotype which is congeneric with the species not named but indicated in the original description of the genus *Ancilla* Lamarck, 1799. Since the two species linked with the name are congeneric, it makes no difference.

SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSED VALIDATION OF THE GENERIC NAME "STRATIOMYS" GEOFEFRY, 1762 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER DIPTERA)

By MAURICE T. JAMES
(*State College of Washington, Pullman, Washington, U.S.A.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)710)

(For application see Stone (A.) *et al.*, 1954, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 9(8): 248-246)

(Extract from a letter dated 20th May 1954)

Proposal for the validation of certain generic names in the Order Diptera submitted by Stone and others : I wish to express my wish that this list of genera be added to the *Official List*. The one that concerns me particularly is *Stratiomys*. If this name dates from Geoffrey 1762, the family name STRATIOMYIDAE will be saved; but if it dates from Geoffrey 1764, *Hist. Nat. des Insectes*, *Hirtea* Scopoli 1763 will have priority. In my opinion, *Hirtea* is a very feebly founded genus and I do not believe it can be maintained on a zoological basis.

PROPOSED ADDITION TO THE "OFFICIAL LIST OF GENERIC NAMES IN ZOOLOGY" OF THE GENERIC NAME "XANTHO" LEACH, 1814 (CLASS CRUSTACEA, ORDER DECAPODA)

By L. B. HOLTHUIS
(*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, the Netherlands*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)601)

When studying the Indo-West Pacific XANTHIDAE with the object to make a thorough revision of this group of crabs, the late Miss Alida M. Buitendijk, who was the Curator of Crustacea of the Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, encountered a nomenclatorial problem which she intended to lay before the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature. Miss Buitendijk's untimely death in September 1950, however, prevented her from carrying out her object. Since Miss Buitendijk on several occasions discussed the problem with me and placed me in the possession of all the data, I feel it my duty to bring this question to the attention of the Commission and to submit the undermentioned proposal.

2. According to the opinion of several of the foremost specialists of the family XANTHIDAE (Buitendijk, Gordon, Monod, Odhner) the generic names *Xantho* Leach, 1814, and *Leptodius* A. Milne Edwards, 1863, are synonyms. Since the type species of these two genera are not identical, the synonymy of *Xantho* and *Leptodius* is a subjective one. The authors who synonymize *Xantho* and *Leptodius*, use the former name for their genus, which seems to be perfectly correct as this name is the older of the two. However, *Opinion* 85 of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature (1925, *Smithson. misc. Coll.* **73** (3) : 13-18) places the name *Leptodius* A. Milne Edwards, 1863, on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, while till now the generic name *Xantho* Leach, 1814, has not been inserted in that *List*. The genus *Xantho* Leach is widely distributed in the tropical and subtropical seas of the world and contains a large number of species. The name *Xantho* has been used by practically all carcinologists and it is the name of the type genus of the family XANTHIDAE. Thus it is highly desirable that the name *Xantho* Leach, 1814, should be preserved. The International Commission is accordingly asked (1) to place the name *Xantho* Leach, 1814, on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, and (2) to add to the existing entry on that *List* relating to the name *Leptodius* A. Milne Edwards, 1863, a note (similar to that already inserted in the parallel case of the generic names of the human malaria parasites, *Plasmodium* and *Laverania*) that this name has been placed on the *Official List* for use only by those specialists who consider that the type species of this genus and that of *Xantho* Leach are generically distinct from one another.

3. The gender of the name *Xantho* provides some difficulties. The exact derivation of the name is unknown. Dutrochet (1819, *Bull. Soc. philomat. Paris* **1819** : 155), who gave a genus of Oligochaeta the generic name *Xantho*, which thus is a junior homonym of *Xantho* Leach, states it to be a "nom mythologique d'une naiade." Agassiz (1843, *Nomencl. Zool.*, Crust. : 28) derived the name given by Leach from the Greek word ζανθός (incorrectly spelled χανθός by Agassiz) for yellow, and emended the name *Xantho* to *Xanthus*. It seems most probable that Leach indeed named the genus after a Naiad, since he treats the name *Xantho* as a feminine word (the type species *Cancer incisus* is named by Leach *Xantho incisa*). It would be logical therefore to accept the name *Xantho* Leach, 1814, as being of the feminine gender, but the question of the gender of this name will remain open to doubt until an authoritative Ruling is given by the Commission. Since the publication in 1834 of H. Milne Edwards's first volume of his *Histoire Naturelle des Crustacés*, the name *Xantho* Leach has been treated by almost all carcinologists as being of the masculine gender. In order not to cause changes in the usual spelling of the specific names employed in combination with the generic name *Xantho* Leach, the International Commission is therefore asked to place this generic name on the *Official List* as being of the male gender.

4. The concrete proposals which I now submit for consideration are that the International Commission should :—

(1) place on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* the name *Xantho* Leach, 1814 (*in* Brewster's *Edinb. Encycl.* **7** (2) : 430) (type species, by monotypy : *Cancer incisus* Leach, 1814, *in* Brewster's *Edinb. Encycl.* **7** (2) : 391) (gender of generic name to be treated as masculine) ;

(2) add the following note to the entry in the foregoing *Official List* made by the Ruling given in *Opinion* 85 in relation to the name *Leptodius* Milne Edwards (A.), 1863 : " (generic name to be used by authors who consider *Chlorodius exaratus* Milne Edwards (H.), 1834, to be generically distinct from *Cancer incisus* Leach, 1814, the type species of *Xantho* Leach, 1814) " ;

(3) place on the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* the specific name *incisus* Leach, 1814 (*in* Brewster's *Edinb. Encycl.* **7** (2) : 391) as published in the binomen *Cancer incisus* ;

(4) place the under-mentioned generic names on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* :—

(*a*) *Xantho* Dutrochet, 1819 (*Bull. Soc. philomat. Paris* **1819** : 155) (a junior homonym of *Xantho* Leach, 1814) ;

(*b*) *Xanthus* Agassiz, 1843 (*Nomencl. Zool.*, Crust. : 28) (an Invalid Emendation of *Xantho* Leach, 1814).

REQUEST THAT THE GENERIC NAME "NOTROPIS" RAFINESQUE, 1818 (CLASS OSTEICHTHYES, ORDER CYPRINIDA, FAMILY CYPRINIDAE) BE PLACED ON THE "OFFICIAL LIST OF GENERIC NAMES IN ZOOLOGY": QUESTION OF POSSIBLE USE OF THE COMMISSION'S PLENARY POWERS TO DETERMINE THE GENDER OF THIS GENERIC NAME

By REEVE M. BAILEY and
ROBERT RUSH MILLER
(*Museum of Zoology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)663)

The generic name *Notropis* was introduced by Rafinesque (1818, *Amer. Month. Mag. and Critical Review*, **2** : 204), with *N. atherinoides* Rafinesque, 1818 (: 204) from Lake Erie as its type species (by monotypy). As indicated by Rafinesque, the name was suggested by the keeled or carinated back (probably an artifact resulting from improper preservation). Although feminine by derivation, the word *Notropis* was treated as masculine by all authors known to us from 1818 until 1951. Recently, Hubbs (1951, *Occ. Pap. Mus. Zool., Univ. Mich.*, **530** : 14) has noted that *Notropis* is classically feminine, and he accordingly altered a few adjectival trivial names to agree in gender with the generic name. This procedure conforms with the requirements of the Code.

2. *Notropis* is known to include some 250 specific names representing well in excess of 100 valid species, making it the largest genus of North American freshwater fishes. In addition to being large, the genus includes many of the most abundant and widespread species on the continent, some of them the subjects of a sizeable non-taxonomic literature. A change necessitating correction of all adjectival specific names (numbering half of the specific names in the genus) would result in misunderstanding and confusion for years, especially by students, editors, and biologists who are not taxonomic ichthyologists. Currently, American ichthyologists are divided in their opinion on the problem : some prefer to continue to treat *Notropis* as masculine ; others wish to be classically correct and to alter the gender of all the adjectival specific names concerned. However, we believe all investigators would welcome an unalterable answer to the problem.

3. Therefore, we request (1) that *Notropis* Rafinesque, 1818, be placed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* (type species, by monotypy : *Notropis atherinoides* Rafinesque, 1818), (2) that the specific name *atherinoides* Rafinesque, 1818, as published in the combination *Notropis atherinoides*, be placed on the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology*, and (3) that the gender of *Notropis* be designated by the Commission.

4. Of the New World ichthyologists who have read this petition all are in agreement with the first two points.

Bull. zool. Nomencl., Vol. 9, Pt. 9. October 1954.

5. The following New World ichthyologists prefer that the Commission exercise its Plenary Powers and rule that the generic name *Notropis* be treated as a masculine word :—

José Alvarez, Mexico
Reeve M. Bailey
William C. Beckman
William Beebe
Kelshaw Bonham
C. M. Breder, Jr.
Martin R. Brittan
C. J. D. Brown
Kenneth D. Carlander
Wilbert M. Chapman
Gerald P. Cooper
Frank B. Cross
Fernando de Buen, Uruguay
Martin del Campo, Mexico
Jack S. Dendy
J. R. Dymond, Canada
R. W. Eschmeyer
W. Harry Everhart
Agustin Fernandez-Yepez, Venezuela
Alcides Lourenço Gomes, Brazil
Myron Gordon
William A. Gosline
John R. Greeley
C. Willard Greene
Marion Grey
Gordon Gunter
Robert W. Harrington, Jr.
Earl S. Herald
Clark Hubbs
Robert F. Inger
Raymond E. Johnson
William J. Koster
Ernest A. Lachner
Karl F. Lagler
Francesca R. LaMonte
Vianney Legendre, Canada
William M. McLane
Romeo Mansueti
John C. Marr
Nelson Marshall
Robert Rush Miller
George A. Moore
George S. Myers
John T. Nichols
A. E. Parr
Edward C. Raney

- W. E. Ricker, Canada
- Luis Revé Rivas
- Leonard P. Schultz
- Donald C. Scott
- W. B. Scott, Canada
- William F. Sigler
- James R. Simon
- Royal D. Suttkus
- John Tee-Van
- Milton B. Trautman
- Vadim D. Vladykov, Canada
- George F. Weisel
- Norman J. Wilimovsky
- Loren P. Woods

6. The following American ichthyologists prefer that the Commission rule that the name *Notropis* be treated as being of the feminine gender :—

- W. I. Follett
- Harry W. Freeman
- David G. Frey
- Shelby D. Gerking
- Carl L. Hubbs
- Frank T. Knapp
- William Ralph Taylor

OBJECTION TO THE BAILEY/MILLER PROPOSAL THAT THE GENERIC NAME "NOTROPIS" RAFINESQUE, 1818 (CLASS OSTEICHTHYES) SHOULD BE TREATED AS BEING OF THE MASCULINE GENDER AND COUNTER-PROPOSAL THAT THIS NAME BE ACCEPTED AS BEING OF THE FEMININE GENDER

By CARL L. HUBBS
(*Scripps Institution of Oceanography, La Jolla, California, U.S.A.*)
and
W. I. FOLLETT
(*California Academy of Sciences, San Francisco, California, U.S.A.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)663)

(Letter dated 3rd August 1953)

For the purpose of identification, we state that the first of the present applicants is the ichthyologist referred to by Dr. Reeve M. Bailey in his letter of 1st December 1949 (1953, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **10** : 228), where he states that " one of my distinguished colleagues, who is in a purist frame of mind, proposed to revert to the classical feminine for *Notropis* " Rafinesque, 1818.

We emphatically urge that the Plenary Power be not invoked in this case for the following reasons :—

(1) It is clear to us, and to ichthyologists in general, that the name *Notropis* is derived, by contractions, from υωτος (or υωτου), back, and τροπις, keel, for Rafinesque in his original description mentioned the keeled back (of a desiccated specimen). (The name of the orthotype, *atherinoides*, does not indicate gender.)

(2) It is also clear to us, from our study as well as from Dr. Grensted's contribution (16/3) that the gender of τροπις is feminine. We quote Dr. Grensted's final conclusion[3] : "I can see no reasons why the word should not follow the natural indication of its termination and be feminine."

(3) The name has recently been used, by at least four authors, as feminine, with the definite statement in two of the works (quoted below) that the proper gender is feminine.

(4) It would be anomalous to have some generic names ending in *-tropis* regarded as masculine, while other names with this ending are treated, properly, as feminine. Such varied usage would lead to confusion and to a need for consulting the nomenclatorial records.

(5) No possible confusion can result from spelling the quoted specific names *cornuta*, *rubella*, *volucella*, *zonata*, *bella*, and *maculata*, rather than as *cornutus*, *rubellus*, *volucellus*, *zonatus*, *bellus*, and *maculatus*.

(6) These considerations seem to us sufficient to render unnecessary the suspension of the rules to justify the obviously crude blunder of authors.

We ask that the name *Notropis* Rafinesque, 1818, be placed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, as feminine, with *Notropis atherinoides* as the type species, by orthotypy, and that *Notropis atherinoides* Rafinesque, 1818, be placed on the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology*. These generic and specific names are now and have long been in exclusive use for the genus and species concerned.

References :

Hubbs, Carl L., 1951. *Notropis amnis*, a new cyprinid fish of the Mississippi fauna, with two subspecies. *Occ. Pap. Mus. Zool. Univ. Mich.*, **530** : 1-30, pl. 1, map. 1.

——. The American cyprinid fish *Notropis germanus* Hay interpreted as an intergeneric hybrid. *Amer. Midland Nat.*, **45** (2) : 446-454.

Hubbs, Carl L., and Kelshaw Bonham, 1951. New cyprinid fishes of the genus *Notropis* from Texas. *Texas J. Sci.* **1951** (1), 91-110, pls. 1-3.

Hubbs, Clark, 1951. Records from East Texas of three species of fish, *Semotilus atromaculatus, Notropis cornuta, and Microperca proelearis. Texas J. Sci.* **1951** (3) : 490-492.

Rafinesque, C. S., 1818. *Amer. Mon. Mag. and Crit. Rev.* **1818** : 204.

---

[3] See Grensted, 1953, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **10** : 230.

ON THE QUESTION OF THE GENDER TO BE ATTRIBUTED TO THE GENERIC NAME "NOTROPIS" RAFINESQUE, 1818 (CLASS OSTEICHTHYES)

By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.
(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)663)

The counter-proposal submitted jointly by Dr. Carl L. Hubbs and Mr. W. I. Follett in opposition to the proposal that the Plenary Powers should be used to direct that the generic name *Notropis* Rafinesque, 1818 (Class Osteichthyes) should be treated as being of the masculine gender submitted jointly by Dr. Reeve M. Bailey and Dr. Robert Rush Miller contains references to other documents bearing on this case, and a brief explanation of the origin of this application and its subsequent history may therefore be helpful.

2. In December 1949 Dr. Reeve M. Bailey addressed a preliminary communication to the Commission on the subject of the gender to be attributed to the generic name *Notropis* Rafinesque. This was given the Registered Number Z.N.(S.)440. Later—in March 1952—Dr. Bailey, jointly with Dr. Robert Rush Miller, submitted a formal application for the use by the Commission of its Plenary Powers for the purpose of directing that the foregoing generic name should be treated as being of the masculine gender. The application so received is that which is published in the present Part of the *Bulletin*.

3. When in the spring of 1953 I was preparing the Agenda for the Colloquium on Zoological Nomenclature to be held at Copenhagen in July of that year, I took the view that Dr. Reeve M. Bailey's letter of 1st December 1949 would provide a convenient opportunity for considering, not the particular case of the name *Notropis* Rafinesque, but the general question of principle underlying the issue involved in that case. Accordingly, that problem was entered on the Copenhagen Agenda as Case No. 16 " Article 14 (or associated Article) : Question of the gender attributable to generic names consisting of compound words of Greek or Latin origin." Three documents were submitted in connection with Case No. 16, namely : *Document* 16/1, consisting of an explanatory note by myself as Secretary to the Commission (1953, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **10** : 226-227) ; *Document* 16/2, consisting of Dr. Bailey's letter of 1st December 1949, the letter referred to in paragraph 2 above (1953, *ibid.* **10** : 228) ; *Document* 16/3, consisting of an interesting and informative letter on the general issue involved which, in response to an appeal for advice, Dr. L. W. Grensted had addressed to me on this subject (1953, *ibid.* **10** : 229-230). At the same time it was decided to retain the Registered Number Z.N.(S.)440 for the general question of principle raised by Dr. Bailey and to allot the new Registered Number Z.N.(S.)663 to the individual case of the name *Notropis* Rafinesque.

4. The problem of the gender to be attributed to generic names consisting of words of Greek or Latin origin formed the subject of considerable discussion at Copenhagen and a detailed scheme was approved by the Congress (1953, *Copenhagen Decisions zool. Nomencl.* : 49-51).

5. Under the decisions taken by the Copenhagen Congress there is no doubt that the correct gender of the name *Notropis* Rafinesque is feminine. The only question now in issue is, therefore, whether, as advocated by Dr. Reeve Bailey and Dr. Robert Rush Miller, the Plenary Powers should be invoked to secure a valid foundation for the widely adopted treatment of this word as being of the masculine gender or whether, as advocated by Dr. Carl L. Hubbs and Mr. W. I. Follett, the rules shall be strictly applied in this case and this generic name accepted as being feminine in gender.

PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO VARY THE TYPE SPECIES OF THE GENUS "CHELONICERAS" HYATT, 1903 (CLASS CEPHALOPODA, ORDER AMMONOIDEA), IN ORDER TO VALIDATE EXISTING NOMENCLATORIAL PRACTICE

By R. CASEY
(*Geological Survey and Museum, London*)
and
C. W. WRIGHT, M.A.
(*London*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)703)

The object of the present application is to seek the help of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in stabilising the nomenclature of the genus *Cheloniceras* Hyatt, 1903. It is hoped that the Commission will be able to give early consideration to this case since a decision is required in connection with the preparation of the *Treatise on Invertebrate Palaeontology.*

2. The generic name *Cheloniceras* was published in 1903 in "*Pseudoceratites of the Cretaceous,*" a posthumous monograph of A. Hyatt edited by T. W. Stanton. It was introduced in an editorial footnote (Hyatt, 1903 : 101), which reads as follows :—

> " In the manuscript a sheet is inserted just before *Vascoceras* with the heading 'Cosmoceratida,' followed by 'In family description notice resemblance of form to Aspidoc. of Jura as more remote than to *Cheloniceras* of the Cretacic.' Another memorandum bears pencil-sketch copies of d'Orbigny's figures of *Ammonites royerianus* (Pal. Fr. Terr. Crét., 1, pl. 112, figs. 3, 4) labeled *Cheloniceras royerianus,* indicating that he had probably selected this species as the type of a new genus. . . . T.W.S."

3. Notwithstanding the somewhat unusual circumstances of its introduction, the nominal genus *Cheloniceras,* with authorship credited to Hyatt and with *Ammonites royerianus* d'Orbigny (1841, *Paléont. française,* Terr. crét. **1** Céphalopodes : 365, pl. 112, figs. 3-5) as type-species, has since been universally accepted by ammonite specialists (e.g. Spath, 1921 : 316 ; Roman, 1938 : 426 ; Humphrey, 1949 : 143). It has come to occupy an important position in Cretaceous ammonitology and has formed the base of the family name CHELONICERATIDAE (Spath, 1923 : 35). Nomenclatorial stability of the genus is threatened, however, by inability to assess satisfactorily the taxonomic characters of its type-species.

4. D'Orbigny's holograph of *Ammonites royerianus* illustrates an immature ammonite from the Aptian of Bailly-aux-Forge, Wassy (Haute-Marne), France, which is stated (Orbigny, 1841 : 365-6) to be 12 mm. in diameter and to be represented in natural size. As noted by Stoyanow (1949 : 104), however, the illustration is of 20 mm. diameter. In any case, the specimen is too immature for positive determination below family level, and authors have been obliged to base their conception of *Cheloniceras* on such species as *A. cornuelianus* d'Orbigny, 1841 (*Paléont. française*, Terr. crét. **1** Céphalopodes : 364, pl. 112, figs. 1-2) and *A. martini* d'Orbigny, of which there is abundant well-illustrated material. Kilian (1913 : 340) referred *A. royerianus* to the same group as *A. ricordeanus* d'Orbigny (now assigned to the genus *Megatyloceras* Humphrey, 1949, *Bull. geol. Soc. Amer.* **60** (No. 1) : 149), while Rodighiero (1922 : 63, 67, 69) even supposed it to belong to the genus *Astiericeras* Parona and Bonarelli (family ASTIERICERATIDAE). On the other hand, Nikchitch (1915 : 3, 4, 13, 50) asserted that *C. royerianum* is merely the young of *C. cornuelianum*, and supported this assertion by illustrations of the young stages of *C. cornuelianum*. Nikchitch's views have been discussed by Stoyanow (1949 : 104), who has pointed out that in this connection it is probably significant that the type-specimens of *A. royerianus* and *A. cornuelianus* were obtained from the same area and from the same stratigraphical horizon and that they were described in immediate succession by d'Orbigny and figured on the same plate. Although we think it very likely that *A. royerianus* is the young stage of a species of the *cornuelianum* group, we do not consider its reference to *C. cornuelianum* to be beyond doubt. There are a number of allied species (e.g. *C. crassum* Spath and *C. kiliani* von Koenen) which are indistinguishable from *A. royerianus* and *A. cornuelianus* at 12 mm. diameter ; moreover, if d'Orbigny's type-specimen of *A. royerianus* is indeed 20 mm. in diameter it is not possible to exclude certain species of *Megatyloceras* as being congeneric. Hence the nomenclature of both *Cheloniceras* and *Megatyloceras* is insecure.

5. Our efforts to trace the original specimen (or specimens) on which the holograph of *A. royerianus* is based have been unsuccessful. In reply to our enquiries (through Mme. E. Basse de Ménorval), M. Sornay of the Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, wherein the d'Orbigny Collection is housed, has informed us (*in litt.* 18.7.52) that the d'Orbigny Collection now contains nothing which could have served as the basis for the illustration of *A. royerianus* and that all possible topotype specimens have been destroyed by decomposition. It is suggested that the specimen may have been returned to the Royer Collection, but the whereabouts of this Collection, if it still exists, is not known.

6. From the foregoing it is clear that doubt exists, and will always exist, as to the identity of the taxonomic species which is represented by the nominal species *Ammonites royerianus* d'Orbigny, and so long as this species remains the type species of the genus *Cheloniceras*, the nomenclature of that genus, of *Megatyloceras*, and of the family CHELONICERATIDAE rests upon an insecure basis. In order to remove this insecurity and to validate existing nomenclatorial practice in regard to the genus *Cheloniceras*, we ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature :—

(1) to use its Plenary Powers :—

(*a*) to suppress for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy the specific name *royerianus* d'Orbigny, 1841, as published in the combination *Ammonites royerianus* (specific name of a *species dubium*) ;

- (*b*) to set aside all selections of type-species for the genus *Cheloniceras* Hyatt, 1903, made prior to the proposed decision, and to designate *Ammonites cornuelianus* d'Orbigny, 1841, to be the type-species of the foregoing genus ;

(2) to place the following generic names on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* ;—
- (*a*) *Cheloniceras* Hyatt, 1903 (type-species, by designation under the Plenary Powers, as proposed in (1) (*b*) above : *Ammonites cornuelianus* d'Orbigny, 1841) (gender of name : neuter) ;
- (*b*) *Megatyloceras* Humphrey, 1949 (type-species by original designation : *Douvilleiceras coronatum* Rouchadzé, 1932, *Bull. Inst. géol. Géorgie* **1** (3) : 195, pl. 3, fig. 4 ; text-figs. 12, 13) (gender of name : neuter) ;

(3) to place the following specific names on the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* :—
- (*a*) *cornuelianus* d'Orbigny, 1841, as published in the binominal combination *Ammonites cornuelianus* ;
- (*b*) *coronatum* Rouchadzé, 1932, as published in the binominal combination *Douvilleiceras coronatum* ;

(4) to place on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* the specific name *royerianus* d'Orbigny, 1841, as published in the binominal combination *Ammonites royerianus*, as proposed, under (1) (*a*) above, to be suppressed under the Plenary Powers.

References

Hyatt, A., 1903 : Pseudoceratites of the Cretaceous, edited by T. W. Stanton. *U.S. geol. Surv. Mon.* **44**.

Humphrey, W. E., 1949 : Geology of the Sierra de los Muertos Area, Mexico, etc. *Bull. geol. Soc. Amer.* **60** (No. 1) : 89-176.

Kilian, W., 1913 : *in* Frech, *Lethaea geognostica*, **2** (3).

Nikchitch, J., 1915 : Représentants du genre Douvilleiceras de l'Aptien, etc. *Com. Géol. Mém.* (n.s.) **121**.

Orbigny, A. d', 1841 : *Paléont. française*, Terr. crét., **1**, Céphalopodes.

Rodighiero, A., 1922 : Sistema Cretaceo Veneto Occidentale, etc. *Palaeont. ital.*, **25** : 39-125.

Roman, F., 1938 : *Les Ammonites jurassiques et crétacées. Essai de genera*, Paris.

Spath, L. F., 1921 : On Cretaceous Cephalopoda from Zululand. *Ann. South African Mus.* **12** : 217-321.

—— 1923 : A Monograph of the Ammonoidea of the Gault. Pt. 1. *Palaeont. Soc. London.*

Stoyanow, A., 1949 : Lower Cretaceous Stratigraphy in south-eastern Arizona. *Mem. geol. Soc. Amer.* **38**.

PROPOSED LIMITATION TO THE PURPOSES OF THE LAW OF PRIORITY OF THE SUPPRESSION OF THE NAME "ARGUS" BOHADSCH, 1761 (CLASS GASTROPODA) EFFECTED IN "OPINION" 185, IN ORDER TO PREVENT THE CONFUSION WHICH WOULD OTHERWISE ARISE IN THE CLASS INSECTA, ORDER LEPIDOPTERA

By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.
(*London*)
and
CYRIL F. DOS PASSOS
(*Research Associate, Department of Insects and Spiders, The American Museum of Natural History, New York*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)714)

The object of the present application is to ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to limit to the purposes of the Law of Priority the suppression, under *Opinion* 185, of the generic name *Argus* Bohadsch, 1761 (*De Quibusdam Anim. mar.* : 56) (Class Gastropoda) in order to prevent the confusion which would otherwise be inevitable in the nomenclature of the Lepidoptera Rhopalocera through the emergence of the name *Argus* Scopoli, 1763 (*Ent. carn.* : 176) as the oldest available name for a well-known genus of the family LYCAENIDAE. The details of this case are set out briefly below.

2. By a decision dated 17th July 1944 the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature unanimously adopted an *Opinion* under which it approved a proposal which had been submitted to it by Dr. H. Engel (*Zoologisch Museum, Amsterdam, The Netherlands*) that, under suspension of the Rules, Bohadsch, 1761, *De Quibusdam Animalium marinis*, and the German translation of that work published by N. G. Leske in 1776 should be suppressed for all nomenclatorial purposes. This decision was embodied in the Commission's *Opinion* 185 and published on 17th October 1944 (*Ops. Decls. int. Comm. zool. Nomencl.* **3** (4) : 37-52).

3. One of the effects of the foregoing decision was to suppress for all nomenclatorial purposes the generic name *Argus* Bohadsch, 1761 (Class Gastropoda). This decision, in turn, meant that the name *Argus* Scopoli, 1763, was no longer an invalid junior homonym. Accordingly, unless action to the contrary is taken by the International Commission, the name *Argus* Scopoli becomes an available name, and by reason of its early date inevitably becomes the oldest available name for a genus of Lepidoptera.

4. The type species of *Argus* Scopoli, 1763 (by selection by Hemming, 1933, *Entomologist* **66** : 224) is *Papilio coridon* Poda, 1761 (*Ins. Mus. graec.* : 77). This well-known Palaearctic species and its congeners are now referred to the genus *Lysandra* Hemming, 1933 (*Entomologist* **66** : 277), except by those entomologists who prefer to regard these species, notwithstanding their structural differences, as congeneric with *Papilio icarus* Rottemburg, 1775 (*Naturforscher* **6** : 21), the type species of the well-known genus *Polyommatus* Latreille, 1804 (*Nouv. Dict. Hist. nat.* **24** (Tab.) : 185, 200). This latter genus was originally based upon a misidentified type species (being referred to by Latreille under the specific name *argus* Fabricius, i.e. *argus* Linnaeus, 1758 (*Papilio*)), but this irregularity was put right by the International Commission under its Plenary Powers in *Opinion* 175 (1946, *Ops. Decls. int. Comm. zool. Nomencl.* **2** (45) : 509-520). In 1948 the name *Polyommatus* Latreille, 1804, which is a household word to all workers in the group concerned, was placed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* with the above species as type species (see *Opinion* 270, published in 1954, *Ops. Decls. int. Comm. zool. Nomencl.* **6** : 25-40).

5. It will be seen from the foregoing particulars that, as matters now stand, the name *Argus* Scopoli, 1763, replaces, as an accidental by-product of the decision to suppress the names in Bohadsch, 1761, according to the taxonomic views held by the specialists concerned, either (1) the name *Lysandra* Hemming, 1933, or (2) the name *Polyommatus* Latreille, 1804. Either of these results would give rise to serious confusion, for the name *Argus* Scopoli, 1763, has never been used except by its author, when first publishing it 191 years ago, while even the later and invalid homonym *Argus* Boisduval, 1832 (*Icon. hist. lépidopt. Europe* **1** (5/6) : 49), which was originally applied in a loose way (i.e. without a designated type species) to a large group of allied species, has not, so far as we are aware, been used for well over 100 years.

6. In similar and more recent cases, e.g. the names in Geoffroy's *Histoire abrégée* (see 1950, *Opinion* 228, published in 1954, *Ops. Decls. int. Comm. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 209-220) of 1762, the International Commission has recognised that the rejection, *en bloc*, of the names in a given book, though in general desirable, may give rise to undesirable consequences in individual cases and has accordingly signified its willingness to give sympathetic consideration to any applications which may be submitted by specialists for the validation of a given name in such a book. In the present instance we are concerned not with the possible validation of an objectively invalid name but with the much narrower problem of the grant of a partial exception in the case of a name included in a book suppressed under the Plenary Powers. The question of principle involved in these two types of case is however exactly the same, and it is submitted that this should be recognised in the present instance, for it is certain that, if, instead of suppressing *en bloc* the names in Bohadsch, 1761, the names in that book had been dealt with individually (a procedure towards which it appears from recently submitted proposals the general sentiment of zoologists is leaning), strong opposition would have been offered by lepidopterists to the suppression of the name *Argus* Bohadsch, 1761, so far as concerns its status under the Law of Homonymy. The International Commission is accordingly now asked to restrict its previous decision in such a way as to prevent the confusion in the nomenclature of the Lepidoptera which would follow the rejection of the name *Argus* Bohadsch, 1761, for the purposes of the Law of Homonymy and the consequent sudden emergence of the name *Argus* Scopoli, 1763, as an available name.

7. The specific proposals now submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature are that it should :—

(1) direct that the suppression of new names in the work by J. B. Bohadsch published in 1761 under the title *De Quibusdam Animalium marinis* effected under its *Opinion* 185 is not to be taken as involving the suppression of the name *Argus* Bohadsch, 1761, for the purposes of the Law of Homonymy ;

(2) place the name *Argus* Bohadsch, 1761, suppressed under *Opinion* 185 for the purposes of the Law of Priority but, under the direction given in (1) above, not for those of the Law of Homonymy, on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* ;

(3) place on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* the name *Lysandra* Hemming, 1933 (type species, by original designation : *Papilio coridon* Poda, 1761), with a note that it is so placed for use by workers who consider that the type species of the genus so named is generically distinct from *Papilio icarus* Rottemburg, 1775, the type species of *Polyommatus* Latreille, 1804 (a name already placed on the *Official List of Generic Names*) ;

(4) place the specific name *coridon* Poda, 1761, as published in the combination *Papilio coridon* (specific name of type species of *Lysandra* Hemming, 1933) on the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* :

(5) place the emendation *corydon* of the name *coridon* Poda, referred to in (4) above (being an Invalid Emendation not now in current use), on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology.*

SUPPORT FOR THE HEMMING/DOS PASSOS PROPOSAL FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF THE GENERIC NAME "ARGUS" SCOPOLI, 1763 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER LEPIDOPTERA)

By N. D. RILEY, C.B.E.
(*British Museum (Natural History) London*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)714)

(Letter dated 7th November 1952)

I should like warmly to support the application that you are making to the Commission in relation to the generic name *Argus* Bohadsch, 1761. Although there might be sentimental reasons for trying to keep such a generic name in the LYCAENIDAE, one of the features of which is their eye-spots, yet to do so at this late stage by allowing *Argus* Scopoli, 1763, to be resurrected after an interment on nearly two hundred years would be to cause far greater confusion in this popular group of insects than can be contemplated with equanimity. Though perhaps the suppression of *Lysandra*, a comparatively recently introduced name, might not cause much confusion, the loss of the old and well-known name *Polyommatus* Latreille would certainly be serious.

PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS FOR THE PURPOSE OF VALIDATING THE SPECIFIC NAME "MINIMUS" MILLER (J. S.), 1826, AS PUBLISHED IN THE COMBINATION "BELEMNITES MINIMUS" (CLASS CEPHALOPODA, ORDER DIBRANCHIA)

By H. H. SWINNERTON, D.Sc.
(*Nottingham, England*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)823)

The name *Belemnites minimus*, or more recently *Neohibolites minimus*, is in general current use for a belemnite of widespread and common occurrence in the Gault and Red Chalk (Cretaceous, Albian) of England and Northwest Europe. The name is also used eponymously in stratigraphical geology, e.g. the *minimus* Marls of Speeton, Yorkshire; the "argiles *à minimus*" of France; the "*minimus* Thon" of Northwest Germany. The species is further one of the standard fossils used in teaching palaeontology to students.

2. The name *Belemnites minimus* is commonly attributed to Martin Lister, but his usage (1678: *Historia animalium Angliae*: 227, pl. xxvii, fig. 32) was pre-Linnean and polynominal. He was describing a species from the Red Chalk of Lincolnshire which is the same as that for which the name is now used.

3. The first available name given to this species is *Belemnites listeri* G. A. Mantell (1822: *The Fossils of the South Downs; or Illustrations of the Geology of Sussex*: 88, pl. xix, figs. 17, 18, 23). The combination *Belemnites minimus* was first used binominally four years later by J. S. Miller (1826, *Trans. geol. Soc. Lond.* (2) **2**: 62, pl. ix, fig. 6), who cited *B. listeri* Mantell in his synonymy. *B. minimus* Miller and *B. listeri* Mantell are thus synonymous names for one species and they are so accepted by specialists.

4. Although there has recently been an increasing tendency for *B. listeri* Mantell to be adopted, the name *B. minimus* has been used in 48 out of 57 post-Linnean references to the species quoted by von Bülow-Trummer (1920: *Fossilium Catalogus* I, part 11: 159). It is quoted as *B. listeri* in six of these references and in two as *B. attenuatus* Sowerby (J. de C.). A well-known work of reference on dibranchiate cephalopods also uses the specific name *minimus* (Naef (A.), 1926, *Die Fossilen Tintenfische*, Jena: 255).

5. In view of this evidence for the preponderant usage of the specific name *minimus*, it is held desirable that this name (as published in the combination *Belemnites minimus* by Miller (J. S.), 1826) should be stabilised as the name to be used for this common fossil species. It is therefore requested that the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should:—

(1) use its Plenary Powers for the purpose of suppressing the specific name *listeri* Mantell, 1822, as published in the combination

Belemnites listeri, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy ;

(2) place the specific name *listeri* Mantell, 1822, as published in the combination *Belemnites listeri* and as proposed, in (1) above, to be suppressed under the Plenary Powers, on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology ;*

(3) place the specific name *minimus* Miller (J. S.), 1826, as published in the combination *Belemnites minimus*, on the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology.*

SUPPORT FOR DR. J. PACLT'S PROPOSAL TO VALIDATE THE GENERIC NAME "MELANARGIA" MEIGEN, 1828 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER LEPIDOPTERA)

By ERICH. M. HERING

(*Zoologisches Museum der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Germany*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)708)

(For Dr. Paclt's application see 1954, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 9 (7); 221-222)

(Letter dated 18th May 1954)

Es ist drigend zu wunschen, da dieser seit mehr als 100 Jahren fast ausschließlich allein gebrauchte Name *Melanargia* auf die *Official List* gesetzt wird, zumal er durch die auffallende Erscheinung der Art besonders weitgehend Eingang in allgemeine Werke, Lehr-und Handbücher gefunden hat. Der Vorschlag von Dr. J. Paclt entspricht besonders der Forderung der Präambel der künftigen *Revidierten Regeln* auf Stabilität und Universalität der Nomenklatur, denen alle anderen Vorschriften unterzuordnen seien.

PURCHASED

COMMENT ON PROFESSOR HOBART M. SMITH'S PROPOSAL RELATING TO THE GENERIC NAME "PALMATOTRITON" SMITH, 1945 (CLASS REPTILIA, ORDER CAUDATA)

By CURTIS W. SABROSKY

(*United States Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Service, Entomology Research Branch, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)594)

(For Professor Smith's application see 1954, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **9** (8) : 247-249)

(Extract from a letter dated 9th July 1954)

Although I am not a herpetologist, I am prompted by the general principle involved to comment on Hobart M. Smith's " Proposed Use of the Plenary Powers to Suppress *Palmatotriton* Smith 1945 " (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **9** : 247-249).

It was specifically to prevent the validation of names in such an inadvertent manner (cf. Minutes of Nomenclature Section of the Budapest Congress) that Article 25 was amended at Budapest in 1927, not only by requiring, for generic names, the designation of a genotype (Article 25, c. 3) but also by requiring (Article 25, c. 1) a summary of characters for the taxon concerned.

It appears to me that the latter proviso is the critical one in the case of *Palmatotriton*. The article in question contains no summary of the characters of the genus *Palmatotriton*, nor is the latter published " with a statement in words indicating the characters of the genus . . . concerned " (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 71, revised wording for proviso 1). The species *rufescens* is briefly described as a " small, broadfooted species about two inches long " but there is no generic characterization.

Accordingly, I do not believe that *Palmatotriton* has any status as of Smith (1945). To give it any recognition, by using the Plenary Powers to suppress it, would in my opinion be a retrogressive step in our long struggle to raise the level of taxonomic work.

SUPPORT FOR PROFESSOR HOBART M. SMITH'S PROPOSAL RELATING TO THE GENERIC NAME "PALMATOTRITON" SMITH, 1945 (CLASS REPTILIA, ORDER CAUDATA)

By ROBERT MERTENS

(*Natur-Museum u. Forschungs-Institut Senckenberg, Senckenberg-Anlage, Frankfurt a. Main, Germany*)

(Commission's reference Z.N.(S.)594)

(Letter dated 22nd July 1954)

Mit den von Dr. H. M. Smith auf p. 249 des 1954, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **9,** 8 veröffentlichten drei Vorschlägen über die Gattung *Palmatotriton* Smith, 1945, und den Species-Namen *rufescens* Cope, 1869, bin ich durchaus einverstanden.

CONTENTS

(continued from front wrapper)

New Applications

Page

Application for a Ruling that works credited to S. A. Renier as of the dates 1804 and 1807 were not published within the meaning of Article 25 of the *Règles*. By A. Myra Keen (*Stanford University, Stanford, California, U.S.A.*) 257

Question whether it is desirable in the interests of nomenclatorial stability to validate under the Plenary Powers certain generic names as from Renier, [1804], *Prospetto*, consequent upon the rejection of that work for nomenclatorial purposes. By Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E. (*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*) 263

Question of validating certain generic names, under the Plenary Powers, in the interests of nomenclatorial stability as from Renier, [1807], *Tavola*, in the event of the rejection of that work for nomenclatorial purposes. By Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E. (*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*) 264

Proposed adoption of a *Declaration* that a generic or specific name based solely upon the Aptychus of an Ammonite (Class Cephalopoda, Order Ammonoidea) be excluded from availability under Article 27 of the *Règles* and proposed suppression of certain such names under the Plenary Powers. By W. J. Arkell (*Cambridge University, Sedgwick Museum, Cambridge*) 266

Proposed addition to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* of the generic name *Xantho* Leach, 1814 (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda). By L. B. Holthuis (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The Netherlands*) 270

Request that the generic name *Notropis* Rafinesque, 1818 (Class Osteichthyes, Order Cyprinida), be placed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology ;* question of possible use of the Commission's Plenary Powers to determine the gender of this generic name. By Reeve M. Bailey and Robert Rush Miller (*Museum of Zoology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, U.S.A.*) 272

On the question of the gender to be attributed to the generic name *Notropis* Rafinesque, 1818 (Class Osteichthyes). By Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E. (*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*) 276

Proposed use of the Plenary Powers to vary the type species of the genus *Cheloniceras* Hyatt, 1903 (Class Cephalopoda, Order Ammonoidea), in order to validate existing nomenclatorial practice. By R. Casey (*Geological Survey and Museum, London*) and C. W. Wright, M.A. (*London*) 278

Proposed limitation to the purposes of the Law of Priority of the suppression of the name *Argus* Bohadsch, 1761 (Class Gastropoda) effected in *Opinion* 185, in order to prevent the confusion which would otherwise arise in the Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera. By Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E. (*London*) and Cyril F. dos Passos (*Research Associate, Department of Insects and Spiders, The American Museum of Natural History, New York, U.S.A.*) 281

Proposed use of the Plenary Powers for the purpose of validating the specific name *minimus* Miller (J. S.), 1826, as published in the combination *Belemnites minimus* (Class Cephalopoda, Order Dibranchia). By H. H. Swinnerton, D.Sc. (*Nottingham, England*) 284

CONTENTS

(continued from overleaf)

Comments on previously published applications

Page

Supplementary application concerning the suppression of works by S. A. Renier (1804 and 1807). By L. R. Cox, D.Sc., F.R.S. (*British Museum (Natural History), London*) 265

Comment on the type species of *Ancilla* Lamarck, 1799 (Class Gastropoda). By Katherine V. W. Palmer (*Paleontological Research Institution, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*) 269

Support for the proposed validation of the generic name *Stratiomys* Geoffroy, 1762 (Class Insecta, Order Diptera). By Maurice T. James (*State College of Washington, Pullman, Washington, U.S.A.*) 269

Objection to the Bailey/Miller proposal that the generic name *Notropis* Rafinesque, 1818 (Class Osteichthyes) should be treated as being of the masculine gender and counter-proposal that this name be accepted as being of the feminine gender. By Carl L. Hubbs (*Scripps Institution of Oceanography, La Jolla, California, U.S.A.*) and W. I. Follett (*California Academy of Sciences, San Francisco, California, U.S.A.*) 274

Support for the Hemming/dos Passos proposal for the suppression of the generic name *Argus* Scopoli, 1763 (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera). By N. D. Riley (*British Museum (Natural History), London*) 283

Support for Dr. J. Paclt's proposal to validate the generic name *Melanargia* Meigen, 1828 (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera). By Erich M. Hering (*Zoologisches Museum der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Germany*) 285

Comment on Professor Hobart M. Smith's proposal relating to the generic name *Palmatotriton* Smith, 1945 (Class Reptilia, Order Caudata). By Curtis W. Sabrosky (*United States Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Service, Entomology Research Branch, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*) 286

Support for Professor Hobart M. Smith's proposal relating to the generic name *Palmatotriton* Smith, 1945 (Class Reptilia, Order Caudata). By Robert Mertens (*Natur-Museum u. Forschungs-Institut, Senckenberg, Senckenberg-Anlage, Frankfurt a. Main, Germany*) 286

IMPORTANT NOTICE

Specialists proposing either to submit applications to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature or to furnish comments on applications by other specialists are reminded that the Commission possesses no whole-time staff and that much time which might be devoted to other work for the Commission will be saved if they will be so good as to submit applications or comments in duplicate, typewritten, double-spaced, on one side of the page only and with wide margins. The Commission's Reference Number, when known, should always be quoted.

All communications relating to the scientific work of the Commission should be addressed to FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E., Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, 28, Park Village East, Regent's Park, London, N.W.1, England.

Printed in Great Britain by Metchim and Son, Ltd. Westminster, London

VOLUME 9. Part 10 30*th* *December* 1954
pp. 287-318

PURCHASED

THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

The Official Organ of

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Edited by

FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

CONTENTS:

Notices prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology: Page

Date of commencement by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of voting on applications published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* 287

Notice of the possible use by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of its Plenary Powers in certain cases 287

(*continued inside back wrapper*)

LONDON:

Printed by Order of the International Trust for
Zoological Nomenclature
and
Sold on behalf of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
by the International Trust
at its Publications Office,
41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.
1954

Price Fifteen Shillings

(*All rights reserved*)

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

A. The Officers of the Commission

Honorary Life President : Dr. Karl Jordan (*British Museum* (*Natural History*), *Zoological Museum, Tring, Herts., England*)

President : Professor James Chester Bradley (*Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*) (12th August 1953)

Vice-President : Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (*Sao Paulo, Brazil*) (12th August 1953)

Secretary : Mr. Francis Hemming (*London, England*) (27th July 1948)

B. The Members of the Commission

(*Arranged in order of precedence by reference to date of election or of most recent re-election, as prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology*)

Professor H. Boschma (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The Netherlands*) (1st January 1947)
Senor Dr. Angel Cabrera (*Eva Peron, F.C.N.G.R., Argentina*) (27th July 1948)
Mr. Francis Hemming (*London, England*) (27th July 1948) (*Secretary*)
Dr. Henning Lemche (*Universitetets Zoologiske Museum, Copenhagen, Denmark*) (27th July 1948)
Professor Teiso Esaki (*Kyushu University, Fukuoka, Japan*) (17th April 1950)
Professor Pierre Bonnet (*Université de Toulouse, France*) (9th June 1950)
Mr. Norman Denbigh Riley (*British Museum* (*Natural History*) *London*) (9th June 1950)
Professor Dr. Tadeusz Jaczewski (*Institute of Zoology, Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw, Poland*) (15th June 1950)
Professor Dr. Robert Mertens (*Natur Museum u. Forschungs-Institut Senckenberg, Frankfurt a. M., Germany*) (5th July 1950)
Professor Dr. Erich Martin Hering (*Zoologisches Museum der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Germany*) (5th July 1950)
Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (*S. Paulo, Brazil*) (12th August 1953) (*Vice-President*)
Professor J. R. Dymond (*University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada*) (12th August 1953)
Professor J. Chester Bradley (*Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*) (12th August 1953) (*President*)
Professor Harold E. Vokes (*Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, U.S.A.*) (12th August 1953)
Professor Béla Hankó (*Mezčgazdasági Muzeum, Budapest, Hungary*) (12th August 1953)
Dr. Norman R. Stoll (*Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, New York, N.Y., U.S.A.*) (12th August 1953)
Mr. P. C. Sylvester-Bradley (*Sheffield University, Sheffield, England*) (12th August 1953)
Dr. L. B. Holthuis (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The Netherlands*) (12th August 1953)
Dr. K. H. L. Key (*Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation, Canberra, A.C.T., Australia*) (15th October 1954)
Dr. Alden H. Miller (*Museum of Vetrebrate Zoology, University of California, Berkeley, California, U.S.A.*) (29th October 1954)
Doc. Dr. Ferdinand Prantl (*Národni Museum v. Praze, Prague, Czechoslovakia*) (30th October 1954)
Professor Dr. Wilhelm Kühnelt (*Zoologisches Institut, Der Universität, Vienna, Austria*) (6th November 1954)
Professor F. S. Bodenheimer (*The Hebrew University, Jerusalem, Israel*) (11th November 1954)
Professor Ernst Mayr (*Museum of Comparative Zoology at Harvard College, Cambridge, Massachusetts, U.S.A.*) (4th December 1954)

BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGIAL NOMENCLATURE

Volume 9, Part 10 (pp. 287-318) 30 December 1954

NOTICES PRESCRIBED BY THE INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ZOOLOGY

The following notices are given in pursuance of decisions taken, on the recommendation of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 51–56, 57–59), by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, July 1948 (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.***5**:5–13, 131).

(a) Date of commencement by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of voting on applications published in the " Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature "

Notice is hereby given that normally the International Commission will start to vote upon applications published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* on the expiry of a period of six calendar months from the date of publication in the *Bulletin* of the applications in question. Any specialist who may desire to comment upon any of the applications published in the present Part (Vol. 9, Part 10) of the *Bulletin* is accordingly invited to do so in writing to the Secretary to the Commission, as quickly as possible and in any case, in sufficient time to enable the communication in question to reach the Secretariat of the Commission before the expiry of the six-month period referred to above.

(b) Notice of the possible use by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of its Plenary Powers in certain cases

Notice is hereby given that the possible use by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of its Plenary Powers is involved in

Notices prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology (*continued*)

applications published in the present Part of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* in relation to the following names :—

(1) *Dama* Frisch, 1775 (Class Mammalia), proposed validation of, for use for the name for the Fallow Deer of Europe (Z.N.(S.)96) ;

(2) *Helicella* Férussac, 1821 (Class Gastropoda), proposed validation of (Z.N.(S.)214) ;

(3) *rufa* Linnaeus, 1761, as published in the combination *Formica rufa*, validation of, and designation as type species of *Formica* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera) (Z.N.(S.)776).

2. Comments received in sufficient time will be published in the *Bulletin :* other comments, provided that they are received within the prescribed period of six calendar months from the date of publication of the present Part will be laid before the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at the time of commencement of voting on the application concerned.

3. In accordance with the procedure agreed upon at the Session held by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in Paris in 1948 (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 56), corresponding Notices have been sent to the serial publications " Nature " and " Science."

FRANCIS HEMMING
Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

28 Park Village East, Regent's Park,
London, N.W.1, England.

30th December 1954.

PERSONNEL OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Retirement of Dr. Joseph Pearson

The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature announces that it has accepted with regret the resignation of Dr. Joseph Pearson (*Hobart, Tasmania, Australia*) with effect from 8th October 1954. Dr. Pearson was elected to be a Member of the International Commission in June 1944 in succession to the late Mr. Frederick Chapman (*National Museum, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia*). At that time Dr. Pearson was Director of the Tasmanian Museum, Hobart. Dr. Pearson has now retired from this post and has decided to settle in England. It is for this reason that he has intimated his desire to retire from the Commission, so as to make way for the election thereto of a zoologist resident in Australia. The International Commission desires to take this opportunity of wishing Dr. Pearson happiness and prosperity in his retirement.

Election of Commissioners

In accordance with the procedure prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology, the following elections to the Membership of the Commission have been made by the Executive Committee of the Commission, with effect from the dates severally stated below :—

K. H. L. Key, Principal Research Officer, Division of Entomology, Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation, Canberra, A.C.T., Australia, in the room of Joseph Pearson (resigned) (15th October 1954).

Alden H. Miller, Professor of Zoology and Director of the Museum of Vertebrate Zoology, University of California, Berkeley, California, U.S.A., in the room of James L. Peters (deceased) (29th October 1954).

Ferdinand Prantl, Vice-Director, Národni Museum, Prague, Czechoslovakia (30th October 1954).

Wilhelm Kühnelt, Professor, Zoologisches Institut der Universität, Vienna, Austria (6th November 1954).

F. S. Bodenheimer, Professor, Department of Zoology, The Hebrew University, Jerusalem, Israel (11th November 1954).

Ernst Mayr, Agassiz Professor, Museum of Comparative Zoology at Harvard College, Cambridge 38, Massachussets, U.S.A. (4th December 1954).

FRANCIS HEMMING

Secretary to the International Commission
on Zoological Nomenclature

28 Park Village East, Regent's Park,
LONDON, N.W.1, England.

4th December 1954.

ESTABLISHMENT BY THE POLISH ACADEMY OF SCIENCE OF A GROUP OF POLISH ZOOLOGISTS TO CO-OPERATE WITH THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Letter dated 29th January 1954, from Professor Dr. Tadeusz Jaczewski, Member of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, to Mr. Francis Hemming, Secretary to the Commission

(Commission's reference: Z.N.(G.)25)

With reference to my former letter of Oct. 13th, 1953, and to your letter of Oct. 24th, 1953, I am glad to inform you that the Section of Biological Science of the Polish Academy of Science has approved, by decision Nr.II-05/196/54 of Jan. 28th, 1954, the formation of a Polish group for questions of zoological nomenclature at the Institute of Zoology of the Polish Academy of Science. The following zoologists have been appointed as members of the group. I give below for your information the names, positions, addresses, and the special field of work of each of the members of this group :

Prof. Dr. T. Jaczewski, Director of the Institute of Zoology, Polish Academy of Science, Professor of Zoology, University of Warszawa (Heteroptera) (*Chairman of the group*).

Dr. S. Adamczewski, Senior Scientific Worker, Institute of Zoology, Polish Academy of Science (Lepidoptera).

Assist. Prof. Dr. S. Feliksiak, Senior Scientific Worker, Institute of Zoology, Polish Academy of Science (Malacozoology).

Prof. Dr. E. Grabda, Professor of Zoology, Zootechnical Faculty, High School of Agriculture at Wroclaw, ul. Cybulskiego 30, Wroclaw, Poland (Helminthology).

Prof. Dr. R. Kozlowski, Head, Laboratory of Palaeonzoology, Polish Academy of Science, Professor of Palaeontology, University of Warszawa, ul. Pasteura 1, Warszawa, Poland (Palaeonzoology, Brachiopoda, Graptolithoidea).

Mgr. M. Mroczkowski, Assistant Scientific Worker, Institute of Zoology, Polish Academy of Science (Coleoptera).

Dr. J. Nast, Senior Scientific Worker, Institute of Zoology, Polish Academy of Science (Homoptera).

Prof. Dr. J. Noskiewicz, Professor of Zoology, University of Wroclaw, ul.Sienkiewicza 21, Wroclaw, Poland (Hymenoptera).

Prof. Dr. Z. Raabe, Head, Institute of Zoology, University of Warszawa, Krakowskie-Przedmieście 26/28, Warszawa, Poland (Protozoology).

Prof. Dr. J. Stach, Head, Kraków Branch of the Institute of Zoology, Polish Academy of Science, ul. Slawkowska 17, Kraków, Poland (Apterygota, pleistocene mammals).

Mgr. Z. Swirski, Assistant Scientific Worker, Institute of Zoology, Polish Academy of Science (Ornithology).

Prof. Dr. T. Wolski, Professor of Zoology, University of Lodz, ul. Narutowicze 68, Lodz, Poland (Crustacea, Ichthiology).

The group will examine and discuss collectively questions concerning zoological nomenclature, in particular matters published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature ;* it will co-operate closely with its Chairman, who is a member of the International Commission; it will promote knowledge of matters of zoological nomenclature among Polish zoologists. A Polish translation of the International Code of Zoological Nomenclature is planned as well. The address of the group will be at the Institute of Zoology, Polish Academy of Science.

REPORT ON THE QUESTION OF THE GENERIC NAME TO BE USED FOR THE VIRGINIA DEER OF NORTH AMERICA AND THE FALLOW DEER OF EUROPE

By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.
(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

(Commission's reference: Z.N.(S.)96)

When in Paris in 1948 the International Commission ruled in favour of the availability of Zimmermann's *Geographische Geschichte* of 1780 but against that of Frisch's *Natur-System* of 1775, it was realised that a problem remained in regard to the generic name *Dama* Zimmermann, 1780, for the type species of that genus, by monotypy, was *Dama virginiana* Zimmermann, 1780, and in consequence, if no remedial action were to be taken by the Commission, it would be necessary to transfer this generic name from the European list where it is used for the Fallow Deer to the American list for use for the Virginia Deer. It was recognised that such a transfer would be bound to give rise to confusion, and the Commission accordingly invited me, as Secretary, to confer with interested specialists on this subject and to submit a Report. Further, the Commission expressed the hope that, pending the receipt of the proposed Report, specialists would abstain from applying the name *Dama* Zimmermann to the Virginia Deer (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 551).

2. As a first step in this investigation, I prepared in 1951 a short note setting out the issues involved and appealing to specialists for advice. This note was published on 15th April 1952 (Hemming, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **7** : 197-198). Already by this time I had received a proposal from Dr. T. C. S. Morrison-Scott, D.S.C., M.A., D.Sc. (*British Museum* (*Natural History*), *London*), for the settlement of the present case on the basis of the existing practice of mammalogists in Europe and North America respectively. Notice of this application had already been given by Dr. Morrison-Scott through the publication of his proposals in the influential *Journal of Mammalogy* (Morrison-Scott, 1951, *J. Mammal.* **32** : 125-126). By these means everything possible has been done to bring this case to the attention of interested specialists, and the time is, I consider, ripe for the Commission to reach a decision on it.

3. The general basis of the settlement proposed by Dr. Morrison-Scott is that the Commission should use its Plenary Powers to secure that the generic name *Dama* shall remain available for the Fallow Deer of Europe, the effect of this action being to secure, without further interposition of the Plenary Powers, that the name *Odocoileus* Rafinesque, 1832, would continue to be the oldest available generic name for the Virginia Deer of North America.

4. Seven specialists have furnished comments on the present case. These are : the following five specialists at the *Chicago Natural History Museum, Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.*, namely (1) Karl P. Schmidt (*Chief Curator of Zoology*) ; (2) Colin Campbell Sanborn (*Curator of Mammals*) ; (3) D. Dwight Davis (*Curator of Anatomy*) ; (4) Bryan Patterson (*Curator of Fossil Mammals*) ;

(5) Rainer Zangerl (*Curator of Fossil Reptiles*); (6) Angel Cabrera (*Cuidad Eva Peron, F.C.N.G.R., Argentina*); (7) Robert K. Enders (*Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pennsylvania, U.S.A.*). The communications so received will be published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* at the same time as the present Report[1].

5. All the eight specialists who have communicated with the Commission are in agreement regarding the general scheme of settlement, and all except one (Cabrera) are in agreement with the specific proposals submitted by Dr. Morrison-Scott. It can therefore be taken, I think, that the solution to be adopted by the Commission should follow the lines of the Morrison-Scott proposal. Accordingly, the chief question to be considered is which of the alternative methods suggested offers the greater advantage. The difference between these alternatives is the following :—

(*a*) *The majority proposal* (*seven specialists*) :

Under the majority proposal the Commission would use its Plenary Powers to validate the name *Dama* Frisch, 1775, with *Cervus dama* Linnaeus, 1758, as type species. This solution would overcome the difficulty caused by the existence of the name *Dama* Zimmermann, 1780 (with *Dama virginiana* Zimmermann, 1780, as type species), for that generic name would an invalid junior homonym of *Dama* Frisch, 1775. This solution would follow also the general practice of zoologists prior to the rejection by the Commission in 1948 of Frisch's *Natur-System* as a work in which the author did not apply the principles of binominal nomenclature (see *Opinion* 258 published in 1954, *Ops. Decls. int. Comm. zool. Nomencl.* **5** : 245-252).

(*b*) *The minority view* (*one specialist*) :

The objection to the action recommended in (*a*) above taken by Dr. Cabrera is that it would be illogical for the Commission, first, to reject Frisch's *Natur-System* as a work possessing no status in zoological nomenclature, and, second, to pick out from Frisch's book a particular name (*Dama* Frisch) and validate it under the Plenary Powers. Dr. Cabrera accordingly proposes, as an alternative, that the Commission, under its Plenary Powers, should suppress the name *Dama* Zimmermann, 1780, and, incidentally also the name *Platyceros* Zimmermann, 1780, and should determine the name *Dama* Hamilton Smith, 1827, as the generic name to be used for the Fallow Deer of Europe.

6. The question of principle raised in Dr. Cabrera's counter-proposal was considered by the International Commission on two occasions during its Session held in Paris in 1948, and on each occasion the Commission, and subsequently the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, took the opposite view to that now advanced by Dr. Cabrera. On the first occasion, express provision was inserted in the *Règles* for the purpose of facilitating the validation under the Plenary Powers of names in books which had been ruled to possess no status in zoological nomenclature (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 65 ; 1950, *ibid.* **5** : 23-26). On the second occasion the Commission, when considering the question raised by the *Histoire abrégée des Insectes qui se trouvent aux Environs de Paris* published by Geoffrey in 1762, were confronted with a work which, like Frisch's *Natur-System*, was undoubtedly written by an author who had not applied the principles of binominal nomenclature but which contained generic names which were in general use by specialists, were important names in the group concerned and which in the interests of nomenclatorial stability it was important should be preserved. In dealing with this case, the Commission had two alternative courses from which to choose : (1) to validate the *Histoire abrégée* under its Plenary Powers ; (2) to reject this work as not complying with the requirements of the *Règles* (Article 25, Proviso (*b*)), but at the same time to indicate its willingness to use its Plenary Powers to validate names in the foregoing work in individual cases where specialists could show that this was desirable in the interest of avoiding objectionable name-changing. The first of these courses was rejected by the Commission, for its adoption would have given a valid status to numerous names, the resurrection of which would have defeated the foregoing object and would have involved a second use of the Plenary Powers for the purpose of suppressing generic names which had been needlessly brought to life by the validation of the *Histoire abrégée* as a whole. The Commission, supported by the Congress, decided, therefore, while rejecting the *Histoire abrégée*, to give public notice of its willingness to validate individual names in that book in suitable cases (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 368 ; 1950, *ibid.* **5** : 106). We see therefore that the policy of using the Plenary Powers for validating in appropriate cases names published in books rejected as not having been published in compliance with the *Règles* is firmly established and enjoys moreover the full support of the International Congress of Zoology.

---

[1] See pp. 298-300.

7. It is necessary now to examine the concrete suggestion put forward by Dr. Cabrera for securing the general object which all concerned are agreed to be desirable by means which involve the use of the Plenary Powers on a larger scale than that involved in Dr. Morrison-Scott's proposal but which avoids the validation of a name (*Dama*) published in a work (Frisch's *Natur-System*) which has been rejected by the Commission as being unavailable for nomenclatorial purposes. The main feature of this scheme is that the name *Dama* should be accepted as from the first occasion subsequent to Frisch and Zimmermann on which it was published for the Fallow Deer of Europe (i.e. by Smith (C. H.), 1827). This suggestion, like Dr. Cabrera's objection discussed in the preceding paragraph, raises a general issue which has already been considered by the Commission. This matter arose at the Session held by the Commission at Lisbon in 1935, when consideration was given to proposals relating to a large number of generic names in the Class Insecta (Order Hymenoptera). These were all important names—many of them forming the basis of well-known family groups—which were in general use but which were incorrectly so used, either because the generic name in question was itself invalid (as a junior synonym of some other name) or because the type species under the *Règles* was not that currently accepted as such. Some use of the Plenary Powers was necessary in these cases, whether the name in question was validated from its original date of publication or whether it was allowed to rank from some later usage, and the Commission decided that the best course would be to standardise these names as from their original priority rather than accept the next known later usage. In taking this decision, the Commission was prompted by two considerations : (*a*) There was always the risk that what was then believed to be the oldest subsequent usage was in fact antedated by some hitherto undetected usage with a type species other than that which it was desired to secure for the genus concerned. (*b*) Similarly, there was the risk that in the period intervening between the date of the invalid usage and that of the first subsequent usage in the desired sense, some totally different generic name might have been published for the genus in question, of which therefore the generic name which it was desired to stabilise would become a junior synonym. In either case the adoption of the " next later usage " principle would have meant that the first use of the Plenary Powers would have failed to secure the desired end and that a second use of those Powers would need to be made if the object sought, but not secured, by the first use of those Powers was to be attained (1943, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 27-30). In the present case the fact that the span between the date of Frisch's *Natur-System* and the date on which the name *Dama* was published by Hamilton Smith (the usage favoured by Dr. Cabrera) extends over so long a period as fifty-two years clearly offers a substantial risk that at some time during that half-century some author either (i) used the generic name *Dama* in a sense different from that now desired, or (ii) that some other (now undetected) generic name was published for the Fallow Deer.

8. In the light of the considerations outlined in the preceding paragraphs, I am of the opinion that the most advantageous course to adopt in the present course is to follow the precedent set by the Commission in 1935 and 1948 and by the Congress in the latter of those years, that is, that, while upholding in its entirety its decision that Frisch's *Natur-System* is not a nomenclatorially available work, the Commission should nevertheless use its Plenary Powers for the purpose of validating one of the names in it, namely the name *Dama* Frisch, 1775, and that under those Powers it should at the same time designate *Cervus dama* Linnaeus, 1758, to be the type species of this genus. This is the course recommended by Dr. Morrison-Scott and by six of the seven other specialists who have furnished the Commission with comments on this case.

9. In accordance with the instructions given to me in Paris in 1948 I now submit for the consideration of the International Commission the conclusions which, after consultation with interested specialists, I have reached in the present case. For the reasons explained in the preceding paragraphs these recommendations are substantially the same as those put forward by Dr. Morrison-Scott; they differ however therefrom by the inclusion (as required by the Regulations prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology) of proposals for the addition to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* (*a*) of the name *Dama* Zimmermann, 1780, which, under the proposals submitted, would become a junior homonym of *Dama* Frisch, 1775, (*b*) of the name *Dama* Zimmermann, 1777 (a name published in a work rejected for nomenclatorial purposes by the Ruling given in *Opinion* 257), and (*c*) of three post-1780 usages of the name *Dama*. In this connection it may be noted that the pages on which the name *Dama* Zimmermann, 1777, and *Dama* Zimmermann, 1780, were respectively published have been reproduced in facsimile in *Opinion* 257 (: 238, 239). The recommendations now submitted are that the International Commission should :—

(1) use its Plenary Powers (a) to validate the name *Dama* Frisch 1775 (a name published in a work rejected for nomenclatorial purposes by the Ruling given in *Opinion* 258) and (b) to designate *Cervus dama* Linnaeus, 1758, to be the type species of the genus so named;

(2) place the under-mentioned generic names on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* :—

(*a*) *Dama* Frisch, 1775, as validated under the Plenary Powers under (1) (*a*) above (gender : feminine) (type species, by designation under the Plenary Powers under (1) (*b*) above : *Cervus dama* Linnaeus, 1758) ;

(*b*) *Odocoileus* Rafinesque, 1832 (gender : masculine) (type species, by monotypy : *Odocoileus speleus* Rafinesque, 1832) ;

(3) place the under-mentioned specific names on the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* :—

(*a*) *dama* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Cervus dama* (specific name of type species, by designation under the Plenary Powers, under (1) (*b*) above, of *Dama* Frisch, 1775) ;

(*b*) *speleus* Rafinesque, 1832, as published in the combination *Odocoileus speleus* (specific name of type species of *Odocoileus* Rafinesque, 1832) ;

(*c*) *virginiana* Zimmermann, 1780, as published in the combination *Dama virginiana* ;

(4) place the under-mentioned generic names on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* :—

(*a*) *Dama* Zimmermann, 1777 (a name published in a work rejected for nomenclatorial purposes by the Ruling given in *Opinion* 257) ;

(*b*) the following names, each of which is a junior homonym of *Dama* Frisch, 1775, as validated under (1) (*a*) above :— (i) *Dama* Zimmermann, 1780 ; (ii) *Dama* Smith (C. H.), 1827 (*in* Griffith's Edition, Cuvier *Anim. Kingd.*, Syn. : 306) ; (iii) Gray (J. E.), 1850, *Gleanings Menagerie Aviary Knowsley Hall*, Hoofed Quadrupeds **1** : 5 ;

(*c*) *Dama* Gray (J. E.), 1825 (*Ann. Phil.* **26** : 342 (a *nomen nudum*)).

10. The genus *Dama* Frisch (or Zimmermann) is currently regarded as belonging to the nominate subfamily of the family CERVIDAE. In consequence, no question connected with the *Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology* arises in the present case.

PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS FOR THE PURPOSE OF STABILISING THE NAME FOR THE VIRGINIA DEER

By T. C. S. MORRISON-SCOTT, D.S.C., M.A., D.Sc.
(*British Museum* (*Natural History*), *London*)

(Commission's reference: Z.N.(S.)96)

I have examined the record of the discussion by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at its Session held in Paris in 1948 on the question of the need for validating the names currently applied to the Virginia Deer of America and the Fallow Deer of Europe (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 551), and, in response to the appeal by the Secretary to the Commission for advice as to the action to be taken in this matter (Hemming, 1952, *ibid.* **7** : 197-198), I now ask the International Commission to prevent the very serious confusion which would result, if, as required by the strict application of the *Règles*, the generic name *Dama* Zimmermann, 1780, were to be transferred from the European species to the American species.

2. I accordingly request the International Commission :—
- (1) to use its Plenary Powers :—
  - (*a*) to validate the generic name *Dama* Frisch, 1775, (*Natur-Syst. vierf. Thiere* : 3) ;
  - (*b*) to designate *Cervus dama* Linnaeus, 1758, (*Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 67) as the type species of the foregoing genus.
- (2) place the under-mentioned generic names on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* :—
  - (*a*) *Dama* Frisch, 1775, as validated under (1) (*a*) above (gender : feminine) (type species, by designation under the Plenary Powers under (1) (*b*) above : *Cervus dama* Linnaeus, 1758) ;
  - (*b*) *Odocoileus* Rafinesque, 1832 (*Atlantic J.* **1** (3) : 109) (gender : masculine) (type species, by monotypy : *Odocoileus speleus* Rafinesque, 1832 (*Atlantic J.* **1** (3) : 109));
- (3) place the under-mentioned specific names on the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* :—
  - (*a*) *dama* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Cervus dama ;*
  - (*b*) *virginiana* Zimmermann, 1780 (*Geograph. Gesch.* **2** : 129), as published in the combination *Dama virginiana ;*
  - (*c*) *speleus* Rafinesque, 1832 (*Atlantic J.* **1** (3) : 109), as published in the combination *Odocoileus speleus.*

3. In order to further the discussion of this question, I recently prepared a short note setting out the foregoing proposals and inviting the comments of other zoologists. This note was published in the February 1951 issue of the *Journal of Mammalogy* (**32** (1) : 125-126).

SUPPORT FOR DR. MORRISON-SCOTT'S PROPOSAL RELATING TO THE NAME FOR THE VIRGINIA DEER

By KARL P. SCHMIDT
(*Chief Curator of Zoology*),
COLIN CAMPBELL SANBORN
(*Curator of Mammals*),
D. DWIGHT DAVIES
(*Curator of Anatomy*),
BRYAN PATTERSON
(*Curator of Fossil Mammals*),
and
RAINER ZANGERL
(*Curator of Fossil Reptiles*)
(all of the *Chicago Natural History Museum, Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.*)

(Commission's reference: Z.N.(S.)96)

(Letter dated 26th February 1951)

We concur with Dr. T. C. S. Morrison-Scott in his request to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature concerning action on the names *Dama* and *Odocoileus* as published in 1951, *J. Mammal.* **32** (1) : 125-126.

COUNTER-PROPOSAL TO CERTAIN PORTIONS OF DR. T. C. S. MORRISON-SCOTT'S APPLICATION REGARDING THE STABILISATION OF THE GENERIC NAME FOR THE VIRGINIA DEER OF AMERICA

By ANGEL CABRERA
(*Cuidad Eva Peron, F.C.N.G.R., Argentina*)

(Commission's reference: Z.N.(S.)96)

(Extract from a letter dated 18th March 1951)

I have seen in the last number (February 1951) of the *Journal of Mammalogy* a note by Dr. Morrison-Scott, stating that he has sent to you a request to the purpose of having *Dama* Frisch, 1775, validated, and at same time inviting other zoologists to express their concurrence.

Of course, I am personally in accordance with the intention of this request as to the urgent necessity of a decision preventing the transfer of the generic name *Dama* from the European fallow deer to the Virginia, or White-Tailed, deer, and I am convinced that there is unanimity among specialists on the opinion that such a transfer is to be rejected. But, at same time, both as a mammalogist and as a member of the Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, I feel myself compelled to express my strong objection to the way proposed by Morrison-Scott for solving the question.

At the Paris Congress of 1948, and, indeed, at the same meeting as that at which the name *Dama* was discussed, Frisch's *Natur-System* was previously and very justly declared " not available for nomenclatorial purposes," the Commission agreeing " that the names attributed to Frisch as from the foregoing work, possessed no nomenclatorial status therefrom." Now, to violate a decision, and a so well justified one, almost as soon as promulgated, seems to me highly inadvisable to say the least. In my opinion, when a book has been declared not available for the purposes of nomenclature, all the names contained in it become unavailable as from that book, and we cannot validate any of these names under any pretext, not even for *fiat* purposes. In accordance with the principle set up by the Commission in the case of the " Erlangen List " (*Opinion* 145), a work unavailable for nomenclatorial purposes " is to be treated as though it had never been published," the names in it becoming available in case only that they are subsequently proposed, either by the same or by other author, and then having nomenclatorial status only " from the date and place of their subsequent publication " (*Opinions and Declarations*, **2** : 12).

In the case of the generic name *Dama*, it is evident that it cannot be validated as from a work declared " to be treated as though it had never been published," and, therefore, non-existent from the nomenclatorial point of view. Morrison-Scott's invitation for reverting to Frisch is, moreover, somewhat dangerous. If we accept one of the Frisch's names, I cannot see why we should not accept two of them, or three, or more, the decision of the Commission about Frisch's book becoming in the end a dead letter.

As shown by Hershkovitz (1948, *Proc. biol. Soc. Wash.* **61** : 41), the first available publication of the generic name *Dama* is that by Zimmermann, 1780. If we reject this on the ground of the difficulties and confusion arising from its transfer to the Virginia Deer, I think that we must search for the first subsequent publication of the same name in a more satisfactory sense, that is, one more in accordance with general use. This was done in the year 1827 by Hamilton Smith, in the fifth volume of the well-known work, Griffith's *The Animal Kingdom arranged in conformity with its organisation by the Baron Cuvier*. In this book, *Dama* was proposed as a subgenus of the genus *Cervus*, to contain the living *Cervus dama* and three fossil species : *C. giganteus*, *C. palaeodama*, and *C. somonensis*.

The fixing, by *fiat*, of *Dama* Hamilton Smith, 1827, as the generic name for the Fallow Deer, would, moreover, involve the suppression, under suspension of the *Règles*, of *Platyceros* Zimmermann, 1780, with type species *P. plinii* (=*Cervus dama* Linnaeus) ; but this name cannot do any harm, as it has been generally ignored by specialists, *Dama* being, on the other hand, used by almost every mammalogist for the genus, or subgenus, containing the European Fallow Deer.

In consequence, I am proposing here to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to use its Plenary Powers :—

(*a*) to suppress, under suspension of the *Règles*, the generic names *Platyceros* and *Dama* as used by Zimmermann, 1780 (*Geogr. Gesch.* **2** : 128-129) ;

(*b*) to declare, under the Plenary Powers, the name *Dama* Hamilton Smith, 1827 (*Griffith's Anim. Kingd.* **5** : 306) to be the name for the genus containing the Fallow Deer of Europe ;

(*c*) to designate *Cervus dama* Linnaeus, 1758 (*Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 67) as the type species, by tautonomy, of the foregoing genus ;

(*d*) to add the name *Dama* Hamilton Smith, 1827, validated by *fiat* as in (*b*) above, and with the type species designated as in (*c*) above, to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*.

As to the contents of paragraph (2) (*b*), and (3) (*a*) to (*c*) of the Morrison-Scott request, I am, of course, quite in agreement with them.

SUPPORT FOR DR. MORRISON-SCOTT'S PROPOSAL RELATING TO THE NAME FOR THE VIRGINIA DEER

By ROBERT K. ENDERS
(*Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pennsylvania, U.S.A.*)

(Commission's reference: Z.N.(S.)96)

(Letter dated 28th March 1951)

We request the International Commission to use its Plenary Powers to validate the generic name *Dama* Frisch, 1775, as suggested by T. C. S. Morrison-Scott, *J. Mammal.* **32** : 125-126.

PROPOSED VALIDATION, UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS, OF THE GENERIC NAME "HELICELLA" FERUSSAC, 1821 (CLASS GASTROPODA)

By LOTHAR FORCART

(*Custos, Zoological Department, Naturhistorisches Museum, Basel, Switzerland*)

(Commission's reference: Z.N.(S.)214)

I hereby make application to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for a Ruling on the following question :—

> Are the " Explications " for plates 1 to 47 of Férussac's *Histoire Naturelle et particulière des Mollusques terrestres et fluviatiles*, which were published on 6th April 1821 with Livraison 9 of the foregoing work, to be taken into account for nomenclatorual purposes under the provisions of the *Règles*?

2. If the answer to the foregoing question is in the affirmative, I desire to ask that the Commission should use its Plenary Powers to suppress these " Explications " for nomenclatorial purposes, in view both of the confusion and disturbance in nomenclature which their acceptance would involve and also of the extreme rarity of these " Explications " which consequently makes them inaccessible for study by the great majority of workers.

3. The facts in regard to this matter are as follows : A. S. Kennard (1942 : 12-17, 105-118) published particulars of the exact dates of publication of the *Livraisons* in which were published the successive instalments of Férussac's *Histoire naturelle et particulière des Mollusques terrestres et fluviatiles*, together with that author's *Tableaux systématiques des Animaux Mollusques*. In the paper referred to above Kennard showed that Livraison 9 was published on 6th April 1821 and contained (1) the " Explications " to plates 1 to 47 of the *Histoire naturelle*, and (2) pages 1 to 32 of the " Tableau systématique de la Famille des Limaçons, Cochlea " (edition containing six pages of " Avertissent ", which forms a part of Férussac's *Tableaux systématique des Animaux Mollusques*.

4. The " Explications " to plates 1 to 47 issued with Livraison 9 do not form an integral part either of the *Histoire naturelle* or of the *Tableaux systématiques des Animaux Mollusques*. They were no more than a provisional explanation of the plates in question, distributed only to those persons who were subscribers to Férussac's work as it appeared in parts. They were not included in the copies of the completed work sold after the last part had been issued. In these circumstances, it is not surprising that copies of these " Explications " are extremely scarce. Indeed, so far as I am aware, there are only two such copies now extant. One of these is in the library of the United States National Museum in Washington ; the other is in the possession of A. S. Kennard at Beckenham (Kent, England).

5. Prior to the publication in 1941 of Kennard's paper, no reference had ever been made in the literature to these " Explications," the existence of which was therefore quite unknown.

Bull. zool. Nomencl., Vol. 9, Part 10, December, 1954.

6. The acceptance, for nomenclatorial purposes, of the " Explications " to plates 1-47, if that were permitted, would involve confusing changes in zoological nomenclature, consequent upon the alteration which would be involved in the type species of the genus *Helicella* Férussac, 1821 (Class Gastropoda, Order Stylommatophora) which would thereby be involved. The position in this matter is as shown in the following paragraphs.

7. The generic name *Helicella* was published by Férussac on page 28 of the *Tableau syst. des Limaçons* with a diagnosis but without any included species cited by name. This page, as explained above appeared in *Livraison* 9. In the " Explications " to plates 1-47, published in the same *Livraison*, Férussac employed the generic name *Helicella* for two species, namely (1) " *Helicella* (*Heliomanes*) *subdentata* Nobis " (pl. 27, figs. 1 & 2) and " *Helicella* (*Heliomanes*) *planata* Chemnitz " (pl. 30, fig. 2).

8. The first author to select a type species for the genus *Helicella* Férussac, 1821, was A. N. Herrmannsen who in 1847 (**1** : 507) so selected *Helix ericetorum* Müller, 1774. This species was included by Férussac in the genus *Helicella* on page 48 of the *Tableau syst. des Limaçons* (species no. 281), which is now known to have been published in *Livraison* 10 on 26th May 1821 ; as already explained no species had been cited for this genus in the portion of the text which was included in *Livraison* 9, where this generic name first appeared. Under the provisions of *Opinion* 46 (since clarified by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology at Paris in 1948, as shown in *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 159-160, 346), Herrmannsen was perfectly entitled to select *Helix ericetorum* as the type species of the genus *Helicella* Férussac, that genus having been established without any cited included species, provided that it is granted that the passage relied upon by Herrmannsen is the first place where the name *Helicella* was validly published, i.e. provided that it is permissible to ignore the " Explications " to plates 1-47.

9. On the other hand, Kennard (1941 : 265), who treated the " Explications " as the first place where the generic name *Helicella* Férussac was published, considered that the only species eligible for selection as the type species of this genus were the two species there cited under this generic name (in explanation respectively of plates 27 and 30). From these species he selected *Helicella subdentata* Férussac, 1821, as the type species of this genus.

10. The species *Helicella subdentata* Férussac is currently treated by specialists as belonging to the genus *Theba* Risso, 1826 (type species : *Helix pisana* Müller, 1774). Kennard's selection of this species as the type species of *Helicella* Férussac is perfectly valid, if it is granted that the " Explications " are available for nomenclatorial purposes. On the other hand, the acceptance of Kennard's action would lead to a most confusing transfer of the generic name *Helicella* Férussac, for instead of comprising as at present *Helix ericetorum* Müller and its allies, it would in future comprise *Helix pisana* Müller ; the generic name *Theba* Risso would thus become a junior synonym of *Helicella* Férussac, while the generic name *Planatella* Clessin, 1876 (type species : *Helix ericetorum* Müller, 1774) would need to be brought into use for the genus now universally known by the name *Helicella* Férussac.

11. I accordingly ask the International Commission to use its Plenary Powers to prevent this unnecessary confusion from arising. The desired object could be attained by the employment of those Powers either (1) to suppress the "Explications" for nomenclatorial purposes or (2) while leaving the "Explications" available, to designate *Helix ericetorum* Müller, 1774 (or, preferably, its senior subjective synonym, *Helix itala* Linnaeus, 1758), as the type species of *Helicella* Férussac, 1821. In either case the result would be the same, since it is only in the case of the generic name *Helicella* that the acceptance of the "Explications" involves a change in current nomenclatorial practice. The International Commission may feel that, as the present application is concerned only to prevent the confusion which would arise if it were necessary to accept *Helicella subdentata* Férusac as the type species of the genus *Helicella* Férussac, the most convenient course would be to adopt the second of the two alternatives outlined above. In that case, I ask that the International Commission should :—

(1) use its Plenary Powers :—
  (*a*) to set aside all type selections for the genus *Helicella* Férussac, 1821, made prior to the proposed decision ;
  (*b*) to designate *Helix itala* Linnaeus, 1758, to be the type species of the foregoing genus ;

(2) place the under-mentioned generic names on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, with the type species specified below:—
  (*a*) *Helicella* Férussac, 1821 (gender : feminine) (type species, as designated under Plenary Powers under (1) (b) above : *Helix itala* Linnaeus, 1758) ;
  (*b*) *Theba* Risso, 1826 (gender : feminine) (type species, designated by Gray 1847 (*Proc. zool. Soc. Lond.*, **15** : 173) : *Helix pisana* Müller, 1774) ;

(3) place the under-mentioned trivial names on the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* :
  (*a*) *itala* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Helix itala* ;
  (*b*) *pisana* Müller, 1774, as published in the combination *Helix pisana.*

References

Férussac, 1821-1822, *Tableaux systématiques des Animaux Mollusques classés en familles naturelles.* Paris et Londres.

Férussac, 1820-1851, *Histoire naturelle générale et particulière des Mollusques terrestres et fluviatiles.* Paris.

Herrmannsen, A. N., 1846-1847, *Indicis Generum Malacozoorum Primordia.* Cassellis.

Kennard, A. S., 1941, "List of British non-marine Mollusca," *J. Conch.*, London **21** : 260-274.

Kennard, A. S., 1942, "The *Histoire* and *Prodrome* of Férussac," *Proc. malac, Soc. Lond.* **25** : 12-17, 105-118,

PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO PRESERVE THE GENERIC NAME "HELICELLA" FERUSSAC, 1821 (CLASS GASTROPODA) FOR USE IN ITS ACCUSTOMED SENSE

By A. E. ELLIS
(*Epsom College, Epsom, England*)
and
R. WINCKWORTH
(*London, England*)

(Commission's reference: Z.N.(S.)214)

The purpose of the present application is to ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to use its Plenary Powers for the purpose of preserving the generic name *Helicella* Férussac, 1821 (Class Gastropoda) for use in its accustomed sense.

2. The following is a summary of the generic names discussed in the present application :—

(1) *Euparypha* Hartmann, 1844, *Erd- u. Süsswasser-Gasteropoden* : 204 (type species, by monotypy : *Helix rhodostoma* Draparnaud, [1801] (= *Helix pisana* Müller (O.F.), 1774, *Verm. terrestr. fluviat. Hist.* **2** : 60)

(2) *Helicella* Férussac, 1821, *Tableaux systématiques des Animaux Mollusques . . . suivis d'un Prodrome général pour tous les Mollusques terrestres et fluviatiles, vivants ou fossiles* **28** (Livraison 9) (This work is cited by the author as *Prodrome Limaçons* or as *Prodrome Limaces.*) ; *Histoire naturelle, générale et particulière des Mollusques terrestres et fluviatiles*, Explic. Planches 1-47 (type species, by selection by Kennard, 1941 (*J. Conch.* **21** : 265) : *Helicella subdentata* Férussac, 1821). (There is also an alleged invalid selection by Herrmannsen, May 1847 (*Indicis Generum Malacozoorum Primordia* **2** : 507) of *Helix ericetorum* Müller (O.F.), 1774 (*Verm. terrestr. fluviat. Hist.* **2** : 33), a junior subjective synonym of *Helix itala* Linnaeus, 1758 (*Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 772). In addition, there is a subsequent, also invalid, selection by Gray (J. E.), Nov. 1847 (*Proc. zool. Soc. Lond.* **15** : 174) of *Helix cellaria* Müller (O. F.), 1774 (*Verm.terrestr. fluviat Hist.* **2** : 28) as the type species of this genus).

(3) *Jacosta* Gray (J. E.), March 1821, *London Medical Repository* **15** : 239 (type species, by monotypy ; *Helix albella* Draparnaud, [1801], *Tabl. Moll. terrestr. fluviat. France* : 90 (= *Helix explanata* Müller (O. F.), 1774, *Verm. terrestr. fluviat. Hist.* **2** : 26)).

(4) *Monacha* Fitzinger, 1833, *Beiträge zur Landesk. Oesterreich's unter der Enns* **3** : 95 (type species, by selection by Gray (J. E.), 1847 (*Proc. zool. Soc. Lond.* **15** : 173) : *Helix cartusiana* Müller (O. F.), 1774, *Verm. terrestr. fluviat. Hist.* **2** : 15)

(5) *Oxychilus* Fitzinger, 1833, *Beiträge zur Landesk. Oesterreich's unter der Enns* **3** : 100 (type species, by selection by Herrmannsen, May 1847 (*Indic. Gen. Malacoz. Primordia* **2** : 183) : *Helix cellaria* Müller (O. F.), 1774, *Verm. terrestr. fluviat. Hist.* **2** : 28)

Bull. zool. Nomencl., Vol. 9, Part 10. December, 1954.

(6) *Planatella* Clessin, 1876, *Deutsche Excursions-Mollusken-Fauna* : 143 (type species, by monotypy : *Helix itala* Linnaeus, 1758, *Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 772)

(7) *Theba* Risso, 1826, *Histoire naturelle des principales Productions de l'Europe méridionale* **4** : 73 (type species, by selection by Gray (J. E.), 1847 (*Proc. zool. Soc. Lond.* **15** : 173) : *Helix pisana* Müller (O. F.), 1774, *Verm. terrestr. fluviat. Hist.* **2** : 60)

(8) *Xerophila* Held, 1837, *Isis* (Oken) **30** (12) : 913 (type species by selection by Herrmannsen, 1849 (*Indic. Gen. Malacooz. Primordia* **2** : 712) : *Helix pisana* Müller (O. F.), 1774, *Verm. terrestr. fluviat. Hist.* **2** : 60). (There is also a later—invalid—selection by Martens, 1860 (*in* Albers, *Die Heliceen*) of *Helix ericetorum* Müller (O. F.), 1774 (= *Helix itala* Linnaeus, 1758) as the type species of this genus).

3. The genus *Helicella* Férussac, 1821, contains a large assemblage of species of snails, chiefly of the families ZONITIDAE and HELICIDAE (Subclass Pulmonata, Order Stylommatophora). For over fifty years the name has been in general use in the literature for the group typified by *Helix itala* Linnaeus, 1758, and we believe this use of the name is acceptable to the majority of workers. It has, however, been used for other groups, and a brief history of the name is given below.

4. Both the *Prodrome* and *Histoire* of Férussac appeared in parts. *Helicella* was published on 6 April 1821 (*Prodrome*, livr. **9**) with a diagnosis but with no cited nominal species, and on the same date (*Histoire*, explication des planches) the species *Helicella subdentata* Férussac and *H. planata* (Chemnitz) are listed with reference to the figures. In the next livraison of the *Prodrome*, published on 26 May 1821, the full list of 164 species assigned to *Helicella* with references appeared. These facts were not known to recent workers until published by Kennard, 1942 (*Proc. malac. Soc. Lond.* **25** : 115). In 1941 Kennard (*J. Conch.* **21** : 265) selected *Helicella subdentata* Férussac as the type species of *Helicella* Férussac, 1821, thus transferring the use of the name to the group of *Helix pisana* Müller, 1774, an entirely new and confusing usage, and introduced (*loc. cit.* ; 264) the little-known name *Planatella* Clessin, 1876, for *Helix itala* Linnaeus, 1758. Before this, *Helicella* Férussac had been very widely used for the group of *Helix itala* Linnaeus, of which *Helix ericetorum* Müller is a junior synonym, following Herrmannsen's selection (invalid according to Kennard but defended by some authors) in May 1847 of this species as the type species of *Helicella* Férussac, as restricted by Hartmann, 1842 (*Erd- und Süsswasser-Gasteropoden*, 143), while a very few authors had used *Helicella* for the group of *Helix cellaria* Müller, 1774, following Gray's type selection in November 1847. These two points of view are discussed by Pilsbry, 1922 (*Proc. malac. Soc. Lond.* **15** : 39) and by Kennard and Woodward (*Proc. malac. Soc. Lond.* **15** : 49). The transference of *Helicella* from the group of *H. itala* to that of *H. pisana* is adversely criticised by Watson, 1943 (*J. Conch.* **22** : 60), who emphasises the valid selection of *Helix itala* Linnaeus as the type species of *Helicella* Férussac by Herrmannsen, 1847,

5. If *Helix itala* Linnaeus is accepted as the type species of *Helicella* Férussac, then *Theba* Risso, 1826, and *Oxychilus* Fitzinger, 1833, come into use for the groups of *Helix pisana* Müller and *Helix cellaria* Müller respectively. *Oxychilus* Fitzinger is already in general use for the genus of ZONITIDAE typified by *Helix cellaria* Müller, though *Theba* Risso until recently has been usually applied to the genus of HELICIDAE typified by *Helix cartusiana* Müller, *Euparypha* Hartmann, 1844, being used for the group of *Helix pisana* Müller. For *Helix cartusiana* Müller and its allies the generic name *Monacha* Fitzinger, 1833, originally proposed for *Helix sericea* Müller, *H. incarnata* Müller and *H. carthusianella* Draparnaud (=*H. cartusiana* Müller), is available and has now come into use.

6. The generic name *Xerophila* Held, 1837, has been used for *Helix itala* Linnaeus by some authors, e.g. Taylor, 1921 (*Monograph of the Land and Freshwater Mollusca of the British Isles* **4** : 112) and Kennard and Woodward, 1926 (*Synonymy of the British non-marine Mollusca*: 213), following the selection of *Helix ericetorum* Müller, 1774 (=*H. itala* Linnaeus, 1758) as type species by Martens, 1860, but *Helix pisana* Müller, 1774, had previously been selected as the type species of *Xerophila* Held by Herrmannsen, 1849, so *Xerophila* Held, like *Euparypha* Hartmann, is a junior synonym of *Theba* Risso, 1826.

7. The name *Jacosta* Gray, March 1821, was published as a sub-genus for *Helix albella* Draparnaud (*non* Linnaeus) (=*H. explanata* Müller, a species which is at least subgenerically distinct from *Helix itala* Linnaeus, though probably most systematists would consider them congeneric). The name is conjectured to be a typographical error (such as abound in Gray's writings) for *Dacosta*, after the 18th century conchologist, E. M. da Costa. *Jacosta* Gray has one month's seniority over *Helicella* Férussac, so a rigid application of the Law of Priority would necessitate its adoption for this group, with a consequent change in the subfamily name (family of some authors). Such a change, involving the replacement of the widely used and familiar name *Helicella* by the obscure and ill-conceived name *Jacosta*, would introduce undesirable confusion and instability into the nomenclature of the group, and the suppression of *Jacosta* Gray is urged in the best interests of taxonomy.

8. While fully recognising that under the *Règles* Kennard's action in selecting *Helicella subdentata* Férussac as the type species of the genus *Helicella* Férussac was correct, we consider that the confusion and instability which would result from the change in the application of this generic name as a consequence of the acceptance of Kennard's selection is altogether too heavy a price to pay in the service of the Law of Priority.

9. Before summarising the proposals which we desire to submit to the Commission, we must add the following note regarding the gender attributable to the names which we recommend should now be placed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*. Of the four names concerned, three (*Helicella*; *Monacha*; *Theba*) are indisputably feminine in gender, and it is only the fourth (*Oxychilus*) as regards which any question arises. Fitzinger, when introducing this name, placed four species in this genus, namely :—*O.lucidus* (Draparnaud);

O. cellaria (Müller); *O. nitidulus* (Draparnaud); *O. ericetorum* (Müller). The last name, being a noun in the genitive plural, has no bearing on the present problem. Of the first three specific names, Fitzinger gave a feminine termination to one and a masculine termination to two. He was therefore inconsistent in his treatment of these names. It is probable however that he intended the name *Oxychilus* to be a masculine word and that it was through inadvertence that he omitted to change to *-us* the termination used by Müller for the second of the names concerned (*cellaria*). On etymological grounds the word *Oxychilus*, being a compound word derived from the Greek and having the word meaning lip as its termination, should be a neuter word. In the circumstances we recommend that this generic name should be treated as of the neuter gender. [*Later Note :* Under a decision taken by the Fourteenth International Congress of Zoology, Copenhagen, 1953, a generic name consisting of a compound word derived from the Greek and having the termination "-cheilus" (or "-chilus") is to be treated as being a neuter word (1953, *Copenhagen Decisions zool. Nomencl.* : 51, Decision 84(7) (*c*) (i)). Thus, the recommendation submitted in the case of the name *Oxychilus* is seen to be in accord with the latest revision of the *Règles*.]

10. The genus *Helicella* Férussac was made the type genus of a subfamily HELICELLINAE by Schlesch in 1927 (*KorrespBl. Naturf.-Ver. Riga* **59** : 116). There is an older name HELICELLINAE Chenu, 1859 (*Manuel Conchyliol.* **1** 421), but this must be regarded as being invalid, since Chenu based it upon the non-existent generi cname "*Helcella* Lamarck, 1812." Lamarck never published such a name, for he used only the vernacular word "Helicelle" (Lamarck, 1812, *Extrait Cours Zool. Anim. sans Vertèbr.*: 115).

11. In the light of the considerations advanced in the present application we now ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature :—

(1) to use its Plenary Powers :—

  (*a*) to suppress the generic name *Jacosta* Gray (J. E.), 1821, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy;

  (*b*) to set aside all type selections for the genus *Helicella* Férussac, 1821, made prior to the Ruling now asked for, and to designate *Helix itala* Linnaeus, 1758, to be the type species of the foregoing genus;

(2) to place the under-mentioned generic names on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* :—

  (*a*) *Helicella* Férussac, 1821 (gender : feminine) (type species, by designation under the Plenary Powers under (1) (*b*) above : *Helix itala* Linnaeus, 1758);

  (*b*) *Monacha* Fitzinger, 1833 (gender : feminine) (type species by selection by Gray (J. E.) (1847) : *Helix cartusiana* Müller (O. F.), 1774);

  (*c*) *Oxychilus* Fitzinger, 1833 (gender : neuter) (type species by selection by Herrmannsen (1847) : *Helix cellaria* Müller (O. F.), 1774);

(*d*) *Theba* Risso, 1826 (gender : feminine) (type species by selection by Gray (J. E.), (1847) : *Helix pisana* Müller (O. F.), 1774) ;

(3) to place the under-mentioned specific names on the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* :—

(*a*) *cartusiana* Müller (O.F.), 1774, as published in the combination *Helix cartusiana* (specific name of type species of *Monacha* Fitzinger, 1833) ;

(*b*) *cellaria* Müller (O. F.), 1774, as published in the combination *Helix cellaria* (specific name of type species of *Oxychilus* Fitzinger, 1833) ;

(*c*) *itala* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Helix itala* (specific name of type species of *Helicella* Férussac, 1821) ;

(*d*) *pisana* Müller (O. F.), 1774, as published in the combination *Helix pisana* (specific name of type species of *Theba* Risso, 1826) ;

(4) to place the under-mentioned generic names on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* :—

(*a*) *Jacosta* Gray (J. E.), 1821 (as suppressed under the Plenary Powers under (1) (*a*) above) ;

(*b*) *Planatella* Clessin, 1876 (a junior objective synonym of *Helicella* Férussac, 1821, as defined by the type designation under the Plenary Powers under (1) (*b*) above) ;

(*c*) *Xerophila* Held, 1837 (a junior objective synonym of *Theba* Risso, 1826).

(*d*) *Helicella* Lamarck, 1812 (a cheironym cited by Chenu (1859);

(5) to place the under-mentioned name on the *Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology* : HELICELLINAE Schlesch, 1927 (type genus : *Helicella* Férussac, 1821);

(6) to place the under-mentioned name on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family-Group Names in Zoology* :— HELICELLINAE Chenu, 1859 (a *nomen nudum* because its alleged type genus, *Helicella* Lamarck, 1812, a cheironym.

"FORMICA" LINNAEUS, 1758: REPORT ON PROPOSED ACTION, UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS, TO GIVE VALID FORCE TO THE DECISION TAKEN BY THE COMMISSION IN PARIS: ACTION NEEDED BECAUSE OF CIRCUMSTANCES NOT THEN KNOWN TO THE COMMISSION

By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

(Commission's reference: Z.N.(S.)776)

The purpose of the present Report is to draw attention to an unexpected difficulty which has arisen in the case of the name *Formica* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera), on which a decision was taken in 1948, and to seek a supplementary decision from the Commission, in order to make it possible to prepare the required *Opinion* in this case.

2. This case was submitted to the Commission in August 1937 by the Royal Entomological Society of London on behalf of its Committee on Generic Nomenclature and the Hymenoptera Sub-Committee of that body. The application regarding *Formica* Linnaeus, 1758, had then just been published (1937, *Gen. Names brit. Ins.*, Part 5 : 86). The specialists by whom the application had been drafted were : R. B. Benson ; Ch. Ferrière ; O. W. Richards. In 1947 this application was re-published by the Commission (*Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 207).

3. In the application submitted, the foregoing specialists asked the Commission to use its Plenary Powers for the purpose of providing a valid foundation for the established usage of the names *Camponotus* Mayr, 1861, and *Formica* Linnaeus, 1758. As the applicants observed, " In the generally accepted sense [these] are both very large genera of world-wide distribution and any change in their generic nomenclature would cause great confusion." According to the view held by the applicants, the foregoing nominal genera were, under a strict application of the ordinary rules, subjectively identical with one another, since, as it was considered, the type species of *Formica* Linnaeus (by selection by Latreille, 1810) was *Formica herculanea* Linnaeus, 1758, a species currently referred by specialists to the genus *Camponotus* Mayr. The applicants asked that this difficulty should be overcome by the Commission using its Plenary Powers to designate *Formica rufa,* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of the genus *Formica* Linnaeus.

4. The proposed use of the Plenary Powers for the purpose of validating the current usage of the foregoing generic names was advertised in the prescribed manner on 29th September 1947. As was only to be expected, the publication of this notice elicited no objections to the action proposed, no specialist feeling disposed to support the transfer of the name *Formica* Linnaeus to the genus now known as *Camponotus* Mayr.

5. At Paris the Commission did not use its Plenary Powers in this case, for it took the view that the end desired could be obtained without resort to those Powers, for it transpired that the selection by Latreille (1810) of *F. herculeana* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of *Formica* Linnaeus was defective and that the first valid type selection for this genus was that by Curtis (1839) who so selected *Formica rufa* Linnaeus, 1758, a selection in complete harmony with current usage. Accordingly, the Commission then disposed of this case by placing the name *Formica* Linnaeus, 1758 (with the above species as type species) and *Camponotus* Mayr, 1861 (type species, by selection by Bingham (1903): *Formica ligniperda* Latreille, 1802) on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4**: 408-410).

6. The complication which has now been brought to notice by Dr. I. H. H. Yarrow (*British Museum* (*Natural History*), *London*) in a paper which will be published simultaneously with this Report (1954, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **9**: 313-317) is that the accepted interpretation of the nominal species *Formica rufa* Linnaeus, 1758 (*Syst. Nat.* (ed. 10) **1** : 580) is incorrect. This is due to the fact that since 1893 all authors have followed the incorrect determination of the foregoing nominal species by Dalla Torre, who, in making that interpretation, disregarded the synonymy of *Formica* and *Camponotus* established by previous authors. Dr. Yarrow points out:—

(1) that the description given by Linnaeus in 1758 for *F. rufa* agrees with the worker caste of what is now known as *Camponotus herculeana* (Linnaeus, 1758) but in no way with the "*Formica rufa*" of authors.

(2) that Linnaeus in 1761 (*Faun. svec.* (ed. 2): 426) repeated his 1758 description of the worker but added descriptions of a male and a female and gave a supplementary description of the same worker.

(3) that Linnaeus in 1767 (*Syst. Nat.* (ed. 12) **1** (2): 962) added to the reference for *F. rufa* a citation to a figure (Schaeffer, 1766, *Ic. Ins.* **1** : pl. 5, fig. 3) which there can be no doubt represents *Camponotus ligniperda* (Latreille, 1802);

(4) that Latreille in 1802 (*Hist. nat. Fourmis* : 143) expressed doubt as to the identity of *F. rufa* Linnaeus, 1758, and, "in order to retain that name for what we now know as '*F. rufa*'," deliberately excluded both Linnaeus' own description and the citation by Linnaeus (in 1767) of Schaeffer's plate;

(5) that Zetterstedt in 1840 (*Ins. lapp.* : 488, no. 3 *nec* 450, no. 8 (which latter is a *Myrmica*)) interpreted *F. rufa* Linnaeus as a species now placed in the genus *Camponotus*;

(6) that Nylander in 1846 (*Act. Soc. Sci. fenn.* **2** : 894) treated *F. rufa* Linnaeus, 1758, as interpreted by Linnaeus in 1761, and also *F. rufa* Linnaeus, as interpreted by Zetterstedt (1840) as synonyms of *Formica herculeana* Linnaeus (i.e. as a *Camponotus*) and in this he was followed by Forster (1850), Roger (1863) and Forel (1874);

(7) that the series of *F. rufa* in the Linnean collection at Burlington House contains the following representatives of the species currently (but incorrectly) known as "*F. rufa*": (i) a single worker labelled "rufa ex desc."; (ii) two unlabelled winged females; (iii) three unlabelled males; that the unlabelled males and females could include the male and female described by Linnaeus in 1761 (these specimens agreeing with the somewhat cursory description then given for *F. rufa*); but that the labelled worker does not agree with the 1761 description.

7. Dr. Yarrow points out that the need for preventing the confusion which would follow from the transfer of the name *Formica* Linnaeus to the genus now known as *Camponotus* Mayr is as great as it was when the Benson/Ferrière/Richards proposal was published in 1937. He proposes that the end desired—namely the provision of a valid basis for the decision taken by the Commission in 1948—should be secured by the use by the Commission of its Plenary Powers (*a*) to suppress the specific name *rufa* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Formica rufa*, and (*b*) to designate *Formica rufa* Linnaeus, 1761 (which, on the suppression of *Formica rufa* Linnaeus, 1758, would become an available name) to be the type species of the genus *Formica* Linnaeus, 1758, the nominal species so designated to be interpreted by reference to the unlabelled winged female preserved in the Linnean Collection in the series of *Formica rufa* which he has selected to be the lectotype in the event of the Commission approving his present proposals. Dr. Yarrow gives particulars of the distinguishing label which he has attached to the female lectotype—it will be recalled from paragraph 6 (7) above that there are two winged females in the Linnean Collection—and he has furnished also a reference to a description of the lectotype so chosen which sets out the characters shown by that specimen which indisputably show that it is referable to the species currently — but incorrectly—known as *Formica rufa* Linnaeus, 1758.

8. While it is unfortunate that the information now received from Dr. Yarrow was not available at the time when the Commission decided to take such steps as might be necessary to prevent the transfer of the name *Formica* Linnaeus, 1758, to the genus currently known as *Camponotus* Mayr, 1861, the receipt of his communication at the present moment is very timely, for it has made it possible to postpone the preparation of the *Opinion* embodying the decision taken by the Commission on this case until it has been able to consider the additional material now submitted.

9. It is clearly desirable that all outstanding matters connected with the name *Formica* Linnaeus should now be disposed of and I accordingly asked Dr. Yarrow to furnish particulars of the occasions on which this name has been taken as the basis of a family-group name. In a letter dated 21st October 1954, Dr. Yarrow has kindly furnished the following particulars :—

1802. Formicariae (Formicaires) Latreille 1802, *Histoire Naturelle générale et particulière des Crustacés et des Insectes* **3** : 352.
1805. Formicariae (Formicaires) Latreille 1805, *ibid.* **13** : 241.
1809. Formicariae (Formicaires) Latreille 1809, *Genera Crustaceorum et Insectorum* **4** : 124.
1810. Formicariae (Formicaires) Latreille 1810, *Considérations générales sur l'ordre naturel des Animeaux composant les Classes des Crustacés, des Arachnides, et des Insectes* : 311.
1813. Formicariae. Fallén, 1813, *Specimen Novam Hymenoptera disponendi methodum exhibens* : 7, 40.
1815. Formicarides. Leach 1815 *in* Brewster's *Edinburgh Encyclopedia* **9** pt. 1 : 147.
1819. Formicadae. Leach *in* Samouelle 1819, *The Entomologist's useful Compendium* : 272.
1820. Formicaedes. Billberg 1820, *Enumeratio insectorum in Museo Gust. Joh. Billberg* : 104.

Dr. Yarrow adds that the first use of the name FORMICIDAE that he has been able to trace is Stephens, J. F., 1829. *A Systematic Catalogue of British Insects* : 357.

10. On the question of procedure, it appears to me that the most convenient course would be for me to submit for consideration the draft of a Ruling—intended later to be embodied in an *Opinion*—which would include not only (*a*) the draft of a Ruling giving effect to the request now received from Dr. Yarrow, but also (*b*) the Rulings agreed upon by Commission at Paris in regard to the remaining aspects of this case. The draft Ruling so prepared is given in an Annexe to the present note. It will be appreciated that it is in Point (1) of the draft Ruling that the action proposed for dealing with Dr.Yarrow's point is set out and that the remaining Points (Points (2) to (4)) are concerned either with decisions on other aspects of the case decided upon in Paris (Points (2) and (3)) or (Point (4)) deal with matters that are purely consequential upon the acceptance of the recommendation set out in Point (1), if that recommendation is approved.

ANNEXE

Draft of Revised Ruling now submitted for consideration

(1) Under the Plenary Powers, (*a*) the specific name *rufa* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Formica rufa*, is hereby suppressed for the purposes both of the Law of Priority and of the Law of Homonymy ; (*b*) the specific name *rufa* Linnaeus, 1761, as published in the same combination, is hereby validated and this name is to be interpreted by reference to the winged female specimen in the Linnean collection selected to be the lectotype by Yarrow (1954).

(2) The under-mentioned names are hereby placed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology :* (*a*) *Formica* Linnaeus, 1758 (gender : feminine) (type species, by designation under the Plenary Powers : *Formica rufa* Linnaeus, 1761, as validated and determined in (1) above ; (*b*) *Camponotus* Mayr, 1861 (gender : masculine) (type species, by selection by Bingham (1903) : *Formica ligniperda* Latreille, 1802).

(3) The under-mentioned specific names are hereby placed on the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology :* (*a*) *rufa* Linnaeus, 1761, as published in the combination *Formica rufa* and as validated and determined in (1) above ; (*b*) *ligniperda* Latreille, 1802, as published in the combination *Formica ligniperda.*

(4) The specific name *rufa* Linnaeus, 1758 as published in the combination *Formica rufa* and as suppressed in (1) above is hereby placed on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology.*

(5) The under-mentioned name is hereby placed on the *Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology:*—FORMICIDAE (correction of FORMICARIAE) Latreille, [1802-1803*] (first published in the correct form as FORMICIDAE by Stephens (J. F.), 1829) (type genus : *Formica* Linnaeus, 1758).

(6) The under-mentioned names of family-group taxa, of each of which the type genus is *Formica* Linnaeus, 1758, are hereby placed on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family-Group Names in Zoology :*—(*a*) FORMICARIDES Leach, 1815 ; (b) FORMICADAE Leach, 1819 ; (*c*) FORMICAEDES Billberg, 1820.

---

*The work in which this name, though dated " An X " in the French Revolutionary Calendar, was not actually published until " An XI." It was therefore published in the period September 1802–September 1803.

APPLICATION FOR THE RE-EXAMINATION AND RE-PHRASING OF THE DECISION TAKEN BY THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION REGARDING THE NAME OF THE TYPE SPECIES OF "FORMICA" LINNAEUS, 1758 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER HYMENOPTERA)

By I. H. H. YARROW, M.A., Ph.D.
(*British Museum* (*Natural History*), *London*)

(Commission's reference: Z.N.(S.)776)

SYNOPSIS

Benson, Ferrière and Richards in 1937 and 1947 submitted a case to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature asking for the preservation of the existing usage of the generic names *Formica* Linnaeus, 1758 and *Camponotus* Mayr, 1861, by cancelling the selection by Latreille (1810) of *Formica herculeana* Linnaeus, 1758 as the type species of the genus *Formica* Linnaeus, 1758, and in its place accepting the selection by Curtis (1839) of *Formica rufa* Linnaeus, 1758 as type of the genus *Formica* Linnaeus, 1758. At their Meeting in Paris in July 1948 the Commission considered the above application and agreed that Latreille in 1810 made no type selection of *Formica herculeana* as type species of *Formica* within the meaning of Rule (*g*) in Article 30 of the *Règles* and ruled that under the *Règles* the type of this genus was *Formica rufa* Linnaeus, 1758, that species having been the first of the originally included species to have been duly selected by Curtis (1839) and that therefore there was no necessity for the Commission to use their Plenary Powers to designate that species as type of the genus *Formica*. Furthermore, the Commission agreed to place *Formica rufa* Linnaeus, 1758 (type species *Formica rufa* Linnaeus 1758) on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, and *rufa* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binominal form *Formica rufa*, on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology*. Recent investigation has shown *Formica rufa* Linnaeus, 1758 and *Formica herculeana* to be conspecific, the former a worker, the latter a wingless female of *Camponotus herculeanus* Linnaeus, 1758.

2. If *Formica rufa* Linnaeus, 1758 is to be accepted as the type species of the genus *Formica*, then *Camponotus* Mayr, 1861 is a direct synonym and the very same confusion, of world-wide compass, which Benson, Ferrière and Richards set out to avoid must obtain.

3. This confusion can be avoided if the Commission will agree to use their Plenary Powers to place *Formica rufa* Linnaeus, 1758 on the list of permanently rejected names, and on the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* to replace *Formica rufa* Linnaeus, 1758 with *Formica rufa* Linnaeus, 1761, the occasion on which Linnaeus first described an individual of the species traditionally known as *Formica rufa*.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

4. Linnaeus in 1758 (: 580, no. 2) proposed the name *Formica rufa*. The description he gives here agrees with the worker caste of *Camponotus herculeanus*

(Linnaeus 1758) but in no way with *Formica rufa* auctt. The description of the nest, on the other hand, cannot apply to *Camponotus*.

5. Linnaeus in 1761 (: 426, no. 1721) redescribed *Formica rufa* giving a description of the worker in the same words as in 1758 together with descriptions of a male and female and a supplementary description of the same worker.

6. Linnaeus in 1767 (: 962, no. 3) quoted the illustration given by Schaeffer in 1766 (pl. 5 fig. 3) under his *Formica rufa*, thus selecting the worker but not the female illustrated in that plate (fig. 4). There can be no doubt that these illustrations apply to *Camponotus ligniperda* (Latreille, 1802), a species not distinguished from *C. herculeanus* (Linnaeus, 1758) at that time. This shows that Linnaeus still confused *Camponotus* workers with those found in thatched nests, a form of nest never made by *Camponotus*.

7. Latreille in 1802 (: 143) was uncertain as to the identity of *Formica rufa* Linnaeus and deliberately excluded Linnaeus's own description and quotation of Schaeffer's illustration in order to retain the name for what we now know as " *F. rufa* " ; at the same time he felt obliged to point out that he only supposed his " *rufa* " to be the same as the Linnean species though in his opinion it might well be Linnaeus's *herculeana*.

8. Zetterstedt in 1840 (: 488, no. 3 *nec* 450, no. 8 which is a *Myrmica* species) interpreted *F. rufa* Linnaeus as a species now placed in *Camponotus* Mayr. 1861, and an examination of his specimens has shown that both his " *F. rufa* and *F. rufa* var.b." are in fact *Camponotus*.

9. Nylander in 1846 (: 894) placed the worker *F. rufa* Linnaeus, 1761 and *F. rufa* Linnaeus Zetterstedt, 1840 as synonyms of *Formica herculeana* Linnaeus. *F. rufa* Linnaeus Nylander, 1846 (: 902) is based on the male and female of Linnaeus 1761. This was followed by Forster 1850 (: 9), Roger 1863 (: 1 no. 7, note :—misprint ♀ for ☿ cf under *F. rufa* : 12, no. 357). Forel 1874 (: 96) synonymizes *F. rufa* Linnaeus with *Camponotus herculeanus* and under *Formica* (: 98) quotes " *F. rufa* i. sp. Linné (Faun. Svec.) Latreille. Mayr. Nylander."

10. Nylander in 1846 (: 894) pointed out that *Formica herculeana* Linnaeus 1761 is a female ; in actual fact the description given by Linnaeus in 1758 also must refer to the (dealated) female. In the Linnean Collection at Burlington House, London, there is a specimen which, though unlabelled, could be the type of *herculeana*. Also in the Linnean Collection is a single unlabelled worker of *Camponotus herculeanus* agreeing with the description of *F. rufa*. A third specimen of *Camponotus* is a winged female bearing the label " *herculeanea* [sic] ex desc." *Formica* (modern sense) in the Linnean Collection is represented by a single worker bearing the label " *rufa* ex descr.", two unlabelled winged females and three unlabelled males. These last five could include the male and female specimens described by Linnaeus in the 2nd. edition of the *Fauna Svecica* (1761) and agree with the somewhat cursory description. The labelled worker on the other hand, does not agree at all with the description of *rufa*, which states " Thorace compresso toto ferrugineo, capite abdonineque nigris " (the thorax is not compressed, the head is not black but red—in fact this specimen is copiously red-marked) and even less with the supplementary description of 1761 which states " . . . squama intergerina ferruginea, acuminata.", which is typical of the worker of *Camponotus herculeanus* (Linnaeus, 1758), but effectively excludes any known *Formica*. No type of *Formica rufa* has previously been selected.

11. Dalla Torre in 1893 and later authors have disregarded this synonymy of *Formica* and *Camponotus*, indeed Donisthorpe (1927) goes even further and quotes the Linnean description of 1758 under "*Formica rufa*" despite the fact that this description cannot possibly apply to any known *Formica* (nor in fact to any ant known in the British fauna).

12. It should be noted that Linnaeus intended to refer to the woodland thatch-building ants by his *Formica rufa* since he states in 1758 "*habitat* in Europae *acervis-acerosis sylvaticis ; in* America septentrionali. Kalm," but unfortunately selected a superficially similar but in fact abundantly distinct specimen for description. His description of the *rufa* female in 1761 (: 426) removes any doubt on this matter.

13. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at the Paris Meeting, July 1948, having had under consideration an application (file Z.N. (S.) 133) submitted by Mr. R. B. Benson (British Museum (Natural History) London) M. Ch. Ferrière (then of the Commonwealth (at that time Imperial) Institute of Entomology, London) and Dr. O. W. Richards (Imperial College of Science and Technology, London) "that the Commission should use their Plenary Powers to preserve the existing usage of the generic names *Formica* Linnaeus, 1758, and *Camponotus* Mayr, 1861 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera) by cancelling the selection by Latreille (1810) of *Formica herculeana* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species of the genus *Formica* Linnaeus, 1758 (Benson, Ferrière and Richards, 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 207) ; " and agreed "to place the undermentioned generic names with the type species severally specified below on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*" :—

Formica Linnaeus, 1758 (type species, by selection by Curtis, 1839 : *Formica rufa* Linnaeus, 1758)

Camponotus Mayr, 1861 (type species, by selection by Bingham, 1903 : *Formica ligniperda* Latreille, 1802) ; "

and "to place the undermentioned trivial names on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology*" :—

rufa Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the binominal combination *Formica rufa;*

ligniperda Latreille, 1802, as published in the binominal combination *Formica ligniperda*." (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 409-410).

14. This decision was taken in order to prevent the synonymizing of a *Camponotus* with *Formica* and to retain the use of *Formica* in the traditional sense.

15. From the above statement it will be seen that if *Formica rufa* Linnaeus, 1758 is retained for the type of *Formica* Linnaeus, 1758, then *Camponotus* Mayr, 1861 must be treated as a synonym, the very contingency that the Commission have sought to avoid.

16. As was stated in the original application (Benson, Ferrière and Richards, 1937, The Generic Names of British Insects, **5**, Hymenoptera Aculeata, *R. ent. Soc. Lond.*: 86 and 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 207) " *Camponotus* and *Formica* in the generally accepted sense are both very large genera of world-wide distribution and any change in their generic nomenclature would cause great confusion."

RECOMMENDATION

14. It is considered that the best solution of the difficulties discussed above will be for the Commission to direct that the name *Formica rufa* Linnaeus be identified as from the description published in 1761 which undoubtedly refers to the species commonly so known and of which two winged female specimens are preserved in the Linnean Collection at Burlington House, and that this identification should be made by reference to one of those specimens. In order to facilitate the adoption of this proposal, I have selected one of the foregoing specimens to be the lectotype and I hereby publish that selection as follows :—" Of the two unlabelled winged female specimens in the Linnean Collection, one is in better condition than the other, having the full complement of antennae, wings and legs, and this is the specimen which I now select as the lectotype of the foregoing species. I have attached to this specimen the following label for this purpose : " Lectotype of *Formica rufa* Linnaeus, 1761, by selection by I. H. H. Yarrow, 1954." The specimen stands in Box 192 in Drawer 54. An adequate diagnosis of the female of this species will be found under the synonym *F. piniphila* Schenck *in* Bondroit, 1918 (: 57) "

15. The proposals now submitted are :—

(*a*) that the name *rufa* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Formica rufa*, be permanently suppressed under the Plenary Powers and that under the same powers *Formica rufa* Linnaeus, 1761 (which under the action proposed would become an available name) should be designated the type species of the genus *Formica* Linnaeus, 1758, the nominal species so designated to be interpreted by reference to the winged female specimen in the Linnean Collection at Burlington House which I have selected to be the lectotype ;

(*b*) that the name *rufa* Linnaeus, 1761, as published in the combination *Formica rufa*, as validated above and as there interpreted be placed on the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* at the same time that the generic name *Formica* Linnaeus, 1758, is placed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology.*

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Benson, Robert B., Ferrière, Charles and Richards, Owen W. 1937. *The Generic Names of British Insects*, **5**, Hymenoptera Aculeata, R. ent. Soc. Lond.

—— 1947, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **1** : 207.

Bondroit, Jean, 1918, Les Fourmis de France et de Belgique. *Ann. Soc. ent.* Fr. **87** : 1-174.

Dalla Torre, Karl Wilhelm von, 1893, *Catalogus Hymenopterorum* **7** (Formicidae) Leipzig.

Donisthorpe, Horace St. J. K., 1927, *British Ants, Their Life-History and Classification*, 2nd ed. London.

Foerster, Arnold, 1850, Hymenopterologische Studien. *Jahresber. höh Burgerschule Aachen* **1**, *Formicariae* Aachen.

Forel, Auguste, 1874, Les Fourmis de la Suisse. *N. Denschr. allg. Schweiz. Ges. ges. Naturw.* Zürich.

Latreille, Pierre A., 1802, *Histoire Naturelle des Fourmis, et recueil de Mémoires et d'Observations sur les Abeilles, les Araignées, les Faucheurs et autres insectes.* De l'Imprimerie de Crapalet, Paris [XVI] + 455 pp.; 12 pls.

Linnaeus, Carolus [Carl von Linné] 1758, *Systema Naturae.* Editio decima, reformata. Stockholm, Laurentii Salvii, vol. 1. (4) 824 pp.

—— 1761, *Fauna Svecica.* Editio altera, auctior. Stockholm, Laurentii Salvii. (45) + 578 pp. Fp. + 2 pls.

—— 1767, *Systema Naturae*, Tom. 1. Pars. II. Editio duodecima reformata. Stockholm, Lavro Salvii. [1] + 794 + [36].

Mayr, Gustav L., 1861, *Die europaischen Formiciden.* Vienna.

Nylander, William, 1846, De Formicis Borealibus. *Acta Soc. Sci. Fenn.* **2** : 875-944 1 pl.

Roger, Julius, 1863, Verzeichnis der Formiciden-gattungen und-Arten. *Berl. ent. Z.* **6** (Supplement) : 1-65.

Schaeffer, Jacob Christian, 1766, *Icones Insectorum circa Ratisbonam Indigenorum.* Volume 1, Pars. 1. Regensburg. Frontispiece [10] + 100 pls. + [12] pp.

Staercke, August, 1947, De boreale vorm van de roode boschmier (*Formica rufa rufa* Nyl.) op de Hooge Veluwe. *Ent. ber. Amst.* no. **275** : 144-6.

Zetterstedt, Johanne Wilhelmo, 1840, *Insecta Lapponica.* Leipzig.

SUPPORT FOR DR. I. H. H. YARROW'S PROPOSAL FOR THE REPHRASING OF THE DECISION TAKEN BY THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION REGARDING THE NAME OF THE TYPE SPECIES OF "FORMICA" LINNAEUS, 1758

By R. B. BENSON, M.A.
(*British Museum* (*Natural History*), *London*),
G. E. J. NIXON, B.A.
(*Commonwealth Institute of Entomology, London*),
J. F. PERKINS, B.Sc.
(*British Museum* (*Natural History*), *London*) and
O. W. RICHARDS, D.Sc.
(*Imperial College of Science and Technology, London*)

(Commission's reference: Z.N.(S.)776)

(Enclosure to a letter dated 18th July 1953)

We strongly support Dr. I. H. H. Yarrow's application for the suppression of *Formica rufa* Linnaeus, 1758 ; the retention of *Formica rufa* Linnaeus, 1761 with the type, a female ; and the retention of *Formica* Linnaeus, 1758, with the type species *Formica rufa* Linnaeus, 1761.

CONTENTS

(continued from front wrapper)

Page

Personnel of the International Commission on Zoological Nomencalture : Election of Commissioners 289

Establishment by the Polish Academy of Science of a group of Polish Zoologists to co-operate with the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature 291

New Applications

Report on the question of the generic name to be used for the Virginia Deer of North America and the Fallow Deer of Europe. By Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E. (*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*) 293

Proposed use of the Plenary Powers for the purpose of stabilising the name for the Virginia Deer. By T. C. S. Morrison-Scott, D.C.S., M.A., D.Sc. (*British Museum (Natural History), London*) 298

Proposed validation, under the Plenary Powers, of the generic name *Helicella* Férussac, 1821 (Class Gastropoda). By Lothar Forcart (*Custos, Zoological Department, Naturhistorisches Museum, Basel, Switzerland*) 301

Proposed use of the Plenary Powers to preserve the generic name *Helicella* Férussac, 1821 (Class Gastropoda) for use in its accustomed sense. By A. E. Ellis (*Epsom College, Epsom, England*) and R. Winckworth (*London, England*) 304

Formica Linnaeus, 1758 : Report on proposed action, under the Plenary Powers, to give valid force to the decision taken by the Commission in Paris : action needed because of circumstances not then known to the Commission. By Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E. (*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*) .. 309

Application for the re-examination and re-phrasing of the decision taken by the International Commission regarding the name of the type species of *Formica* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera). By I. H. H. Yarrow, M.A., Ph.D. (*British Museum (Natural History), London*) 313

Comments on applications

Support for Dr. Morrison-Scott's proposal relating to the name for the Virginia Deer. By Karl P. Schmidt (*Chief Curator of Zoology*), Colvin Campbell Sanborn (*Curator of Mammals*), D. Dwight Davies (*Curator of Anatomy*), Bryan Patterson (*Curator of Fossil Mammals*), and Rainer Zangerl (*Curator of Fossil Reptiles*), all of the *Chicago Natural History Museum, Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.* 299

CONTENTS

(*continued from overleaf*)

Page

Counter-proposal to certain portions of Dr. T. C. S. Morrison-Scott's application regarding the stabilisation of the generic name for the Virginia Deer of America. By Angel Cabrera (*Cuidad Eva Peron, F.C.N.G.R., Argentina*) 299

Support for Dr. Morrison-Scott's proposal relating to the name for the Virginia Deer. By Robert K. Enders (*Swarthmore College, Swarthmore, Pennsylvania, U.S.A.*) 300

Support for Dr. I. H. H. Yarrow's proposal for the re-phrasing of the decision taken by the International Commission regarding the name of the type species of *Formica* Linnaeus, 1758. By R. B. Benson, M.A. (*British Museum* (*Natural History*), *London*), G. E. J. Nixon, B.A. (*Commonwealth Institute of Entomology*, *London*), J. F. Perkins, B.Sc. (*British Museum* (*Natural History*), *London*) and O. W. Richards, D.Sc. (*Imperial College of Science and Technology*, *London*) 318

Printed in Great Britain by METCHIM AND SON, LTD. Westminster, London

VOLUME 9. Part 11
pp. 319-350

PURCHASED

30th December 1954

THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

The Official Organ of

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Edited by

FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

CONTENTS:

Notices prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology:

Page
Date of commencement by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of voting on applications published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* 319
Notice of the possible use by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of its Plenary Powers in certain cases 320

(*continued inside back wrapper*)

LONDON:

Printed by Order of the International Trust for
Zoological Nomenclature
and
Sold on behalf of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
by the International Trust
at its Publications Office,
41 Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.
1954

Price Fifteen Shillings

(*All rights reserved*)

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

A. The Officers of the Commission

Honorary Life President : Dr. Karl Jordan (*British Museum* (*Natural History*), *Zoological Museum, Tring, Herts., England*)

President : Professor James Chester Bradley (*Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*) (12th August 1953)

Vice-President : Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (*Sao Paulo, Brazil*) (12th August 1953)

Secretary : Mr. Francis Hemming (*London, England*) (27th July 1948)

B. The Members of the Commission

(*Arranged in order of precedence by reference to date of election or of most recent re-election, as prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology*)

Professor H. Boschma (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The Netherlands*) (1st January 1947)
Senor Dr. Angel Cabrera (*Eva Peron, F.C.N.G.R., Argentina*) (27th July 1948)
Mr. Francis Hemming (*London, England*) (27th July 1948) (*Secretary*)
Dr. Henning Lemche (*Universitetets Zoologiske Museum, Copenhagen, Denmark*) (27th July 1948)
Professor Teiso Esaki (*Kyushu University, Fukuoka, Japan*) (17th April 1950)
Professor Pierre Bonnet (*Université de Toulouse, France*) (9th June 1950)
Mr. Norman Denbigh Riley (*British Museum* (*Natural History*) *London*) (9th June 1950)
Professor Dr. Tadeusz Jaczewski (*Institute of Zoology, Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw, Poland*) (15th June 1950)
Professor Dr. Robert Mertens (*Natur-Museum u. Forschungs-Institut Senckenberg, Frankfurt a. M., Germany*) (5th July 1950)
Professor Dr. Erich Martin Hering (*Zoologisches Museum der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Germany*) (5th July 1950)
Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (*S. Paulo, Brazil*) (12th August 1953) (*Vice-President*)
Professor J. R. Dymond (*University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada*) (12th August 1953)
Professor J. Chester Bradley (*Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*) (12th August 1953) (*President*)
Professor Harold E. Vokes (*Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, U.S.A.*) (12th August 1953)
Professor Béla Hankó (*Mezögazdasági Muzeum, Budapest, Hungary*) (12th August 1953)
Dr. Norman R. Stoll (*Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, New York, N.Y., U.S.A.*) (12th August 1953)
Mr. P. C. Sylvester-Bradley (*Sheffield University, Sheffield, England*) (12th August 1953)
Dr. L. B. Holthuis (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The Netherlands*) (12th August 1953)
Dr. K. H. L. Key (*Commonwealth Scientific and Industrial Research Organisation, Canberra, A.C.T., Australia*) (15th October 1954)
Dr. Alden H. Miller (*Museum of Vertebrate Zoology, University of California, Berkeley, California, U.S.A.* (29th October 1954)
Doc. Dr. Ferdinand Prantl (*Národni Museum v. Praze, Prague, Czechoslovakia*) (30th October 1954)
Professor Dr. Wilhelm Kühnelt (*Zoologisches Institut, Der Universität, Vienna, Austria*) (6th November 1954)
Professor F. S. Bodenheimer (*The Hebrew University, Jerusalem, Israel*) (11th November 1954)
Professor Ernst Mayr (*Museum of Comparative Zoology at Harvard College, Cambridge, Massachusetts, U.S.A.*) (4th December 1954)

BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Volume 9, Part 11 (pp. 319-350) 30th December, 1954

NOTICES PRESCRIBED BY THE INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ZOOLOGY

The following notices are given in pursuance of decisions taken, on the recommendation of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature (see 150, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 51–56, 57–59), by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, July 1948 (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **5** : 5–13, 131).

(a) Date of commencement by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of voting on applications published in the " Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature "

NOTICE is hereby given that normally the International Commission may start to vote upon applications published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* on the expiry of a period of six calendar months from the date of publication in the *Bulletin* of the applications in question. Any specialist who may desire to comment upon any of the applications published in the present Part (vol. 9, Part 11) of the *Bulletin* is accordingly invited to do so in writing to the Secretary to the Commission, as quickly as possible and in any case, in sufficient time to enable to communication in question to reach the Secretariat of the Commission before the expiry of the six-month period referred to above.

Notices prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology (*continued*)

(b) Notice of the possible use by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of its Plenary Powers in certain cases

1. NOTICE is hereby given that the possible use by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of its Plenary Powers, is involved in applications published in the present Part of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* in relation to the following names :—

(1) *Carinifex* Binney, 1865 (Class Gastropoda), validation of (Z.N.(S.)224);

(2) XANTHINAE Dana, 1851 (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda), validation of (Z.N.(S.)601);

(3) *Discias* Rathbun, 1902 (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda), validation of (Z.N.(S.)829);

(4) *Upogebia* Leach, 1814, and *Processa* Leach, 1815 (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda), validation of (Z.N.(S.)830);

(5) UPOGEBIINAE Borradaile, 1903, and PROCESSIDAE Ortmann, 1896 (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda), validation of (Z.N.(S.)830).

2. Comments received in sufficient time will be published in the *Bulletin :* other comments, provided that they are received within the prescribed period of six calendar months from the date of publication of the present Part will be laid before the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at the time of commencement of voting on the application concerned.

3. In accordance with the arrangement agreed upon at the Session held by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in Paris in 1948 (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 56) corresponding Notices have been sent to the serial publications " Nature " and " Science."

FRANCIS HEMMING
Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

28 Park Village East, Regent's Park,
LONDON, N.W.1, England.

30*th December* 1954.

PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO VALIDATE THE GENERIC NAME " CARINIFEX " BINNEY, 1865 (CLASS GASTROPODA)

By JOSHUA L. BAILY, Jr.

(*San Diego, California, U.S.A.*)

(Commission's reference : Z.N.(S.)224)

In the course of an investigation on which I am engaged, the old matter of the relative status of the names *Carinifex* Binney, 1863, and *Megasystropha* Lea, 1864 (Class Gastropoda, Order Pulmonata, Suborder Basommatophora), has come up again, and I accordingly appeal to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for a decision which will finally settle this question in favour of the name *Carinifex* Binney.

2. This question was submitted by Dr. W. H. Dall to the International Commission some years ago, and the Commission's decision was given in *Opinion* 87. On re-reading that *Opinion*, I have, however, been led to the conclusion that not all the relevant data were before the Commission at the time when it gave the Ruling embodied in the foregoing *Opinion*. In any case that *Opinion* did not provide a definite answer on the question submitted of the availability of the generic name *Carinifex* Binney, by placing either that name or the name *Megasystropha* Lea on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*.

3. The following is a list of the papers which are relevant to the present problem :—

(1) In 1858 Lea published a paper (*Proc. Acad. nat. Sci. Philad.* **10** : 91) in which he gave a recognisable description of a species to which he applied the name *Planorbis newberryi*. The specimens on which the description of this species was based were taken at Klamath Lake and Canoe Creek, California.

(2) In 1863 there appeared a pamphlet bearing the title " Smithsonian Miscellaneous Collection 000 " [i.e. issued without a number], which bore the date 9th December 1863. In this pamphlet Binney, under the heading " Planorbinae," listed without comment the names of various species of *Planorbis* and *Segmentina*. At the same time Binney listed without comment what he called " *Carinifex newberryi* Lea."

(3) In 1864 (*Proc. Acad. nat. Sci. Philad.* **16** : 5) Lea published a description of his *Planorbis newberryi* (in supplement to that which he had published in 1858) ; at the conclusion of this paper, he added under the heading " Remarks " : " This is a very

---

remarkable shell, and I have placed it among the *Planorbes*, until the soft parts may be observed in a living state; they may be found to differ from the true *Planorbes*." Furthei, he added in a footnote: "Provisionally it may be called *Megasystropha* . . . the umbilicus being large and vortex-like."

(4) In February 1865 Binney published a paper (*Amer. J. Conch.* **1**: 50, pl. 7, figs. 6-7), which contained the first published figure of the species *Planorbis newberryi* Lea, 1858. In this paper Binney referred to this species as *Carinifex newberryi* (Lea).

(5) In September 1865 Binney published a further paper ("Land and Freshwater Shells of North America") (*Smithson. misc. Coll.* **143** (Pt. 2): 74-75), in which he defined the genus *Carinifex* and gave a figure of *Carinifex newberryi* (Lea) (fig. 120).

(6) In 1867 Lea published a paper (*J. Acad. nat. Sci. Philad.* **6**) in which he gave a figure (pl. 23, fig. 68) of the species to which in 1858 he had given the name *Planorbis newberryi* and which he now referred to under the name *Megasystropha newberryi*.

4. The discussion of the generic name *Carinifex* has centered around the question whether Binney's paper of 1863 can be regarded as having been duly published and whether the citation in that paper of the name "*Carinifex newberryi* Lea," without any supporting data is sufficient to identify the species to which Binney was referring. On both these questions an adverse view was taken by the Commission in *Opinion* 87. As regards the second of these questions it was pointed out in that *Opinion* that Lea had published other specific names comprising the trivial name *newberryi*, e.g. *Ancylus newberryi*, *Goniobasis newberryi* and *Melania newberryi*, and the view was expressed that, as Binney did not cite either the name of the genus in which Lea had originally published the species to which he (Binney) was referring or a bibliographical reference to the place where that name was published, it was not possible to determine the identity of the species cited by Binney as "*Carinifex newberryi* Lea" and therefore that the generic name *Carinifex* acquired no availability in virtue of being so cited. Considering that the species with which we are here concerned was originally described by Lea as belonging to the genus *Planorbis* and that the name "*Carinifex newberryi* Lea" cited by Binney was placed by that author under the heading "Planorbinae," the foregoing objection advanced against the identification of the species referred to by Binney does not stand any close examination. The other ground on which in *Opinion* 87 the Commission rejected Binney's name *Carinifex*, namely that the document in which it appeared was a printers' proof appears also to be open to question, for it was printed and distributed from the Smithsonian Institution in considerable numbers for comment by interested specialists, whereas a printers' proof is a document printed in only a very small number of copies, its sole purpose being to enable the author to make such corrections as are necessary before the book or paper concerned is actually published. It would, therefore, as it seems to me, have been more appropriate to examine the availability of Binney's book not from the standpoint of whether it existed only as a printers' proof (as was done in *Opinion* 87) but from the more general standpoint of whether it had been duly published within the meaning of Article 25. Admittedly, such an approach to the problem would have been difficult at the time when the Commission considered Dr. Dall's application in regard to the status of the name *Carinifex* Binney, for at that time there existed only the sketchiest definition of the criteria to be adopted in determining whether a given document should be regarded as having been " published " for the purposes of the Article referred to above. This was still the position when in 1946 I first submitted the present application to the Commission for decision. Since then, however, the position has been completely altered by the comprehensive definition of the expression " divulgué dans une publication " adopted by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology (on the recommendation of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature) at Paris in July 1948. Under that definition (1950, *Bull. Zool. Nomencl.*, **4** : 215-21) it is evident that the paper by Binney in which the name *Carinifex* first appeared, did not satisfy the conditions provided in the *Règles* as criteria for publication at the time it was printed, but the question then arises as to whether it acquired status as a publication within the meaning of the *Règles* when these conditions were later complied with by the distribution of quantities of printed copies to dealers for resale to the public, and the public advertising of the availability of the document in such a way as to secure universal circulation. The International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature has never rendered an opinion as to whether a printed sheet not intended as a publication can subsequently become one by fulfillment of the requirements set out in a definition of what constitutes publication ; in the present instance we are not justified in concluding that the name *Carinifex* acquired no status in zoological nomenclature by virtue of having been included in that paper, but only that a reasonable doubt exists as to whether it may have done so.

5. Turning to Lea's paper of 1864, no one will deny that the method there adopted for publishing the new generic name *Megasystropha* deserves the strongest censure, for the conditional publication of names in this way opens the door to serious abuses. Nevertheless, although there now exists in the *Règles* a *Recommendation* strongly deprecating the publication of names conditionally it is not prohibited (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 144-145), though, since the addition to Article 25 of Proviso (c) (which requires that a statement of the distinguishing characters must be published in order to render available any name published after 31st December 1930), it has become impossible validly to publish a name in the manner adopted by Lea, when publishing the name *Megasystropha*. The name *Megasystropha* Lea, 1864, cannot therefore be ruled out of account; it is true that Lea gave no characters for this genus but he did cite as belonging to it a species possessing a previously published specific name (*Planorbis newberryi* Lea, 1858). The name *Megasystropha* therefore was published with an " indication " as required by Proviso (*a*) to Article 25 (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 78-80). Further, its type species is *Planorbis newberryi* Lea, 1858, by monotypy.

6. We come next to Binney's papers published in 1865, in each of which he used the generic name *Carinifex*. In the first of these papers—that pubished in February 1865 in the *American Journal of Conchology*—Binney, who in 1863 had made clear that, in his view, his Catalog of the North American Pulmonates printed by the Smithsonian Institution (discussed earlier in the present application) could not properly be regarded as having been then published, seems now to have changed his mind, for on this occasion he wrote : " In the above catalog I proposed the generic name *Carinifex* for the species described as *Planorbis newberryi* Lea . . . . Two species of this genus have been described, *C. newberryi* and *C. breweri*, Newcomb. The latter may prove to be a variety of the former." It is evident from these words that Binney did not look upon himself as then publishing the name *Carinifex* for the first time, but it is in fact from this paper that under the *Règles* the name *Carinifex* takes priority. It will be noted that Binney did not designate a type species for *Carinifex*, probably because he considered that as the result of his earlier (1863) action *Planorbis newberryi* Lea, 1858, was already the type species by monotypy.

7. Under a strict application of the *Règles* Binney was free to designate as type species either of the two nominal species which he assigned to *Carinifex* in the first of his two papers published in 1865, but since *Carinifex breweri* was a *species inquirienda* it must be excluded for consideration by any subsequent writer as type. Therefore the type species must be *Carinifex newberryi* Lea, and the only problem is to determine who first so designated it. Baker (1945, *The Molluscan family Planorbidae* : 154) lists ten designations of this species, but examination of the works in which the supposed designations were made indicated that most of them cited the species only as an example. The first author to state unequivocally that *Carinifex newberryi* was the type species of *Carinifex* was Paul Fischer (1883, *Man. de Conchyl.* **1** : 508). To be sure, Fischer did not state that he was designating a type species ; the implication is that he was citing a species which he believed had already been designated type species, and which under the rules is the only one that can serve as such and I can see no reason why Fischer's statement " Type : *C. newberryi* Lea " should not be accepted as a legitimate type designation.

9. In the light of the foregoing survey it appears that (1) under the *Règles* it is doubtful whether the generic name *Carinifex* in Binney's 1863 paper has any nomenclatorial status ; (2) that in 1864 Lea established validly (though in an objectionable manner) the generic name *Megasystropha* and that the type species of this genus by monotypy is *Planorbis newberryi* Lea, 1858 ; (3) that in 1865 Binney established the nominal genus *Carinifex* in conditions which satisfy the *Règles* and that this genus also has the above species as its type species (by subsequent selection) ; (4) that, in consequence of (2) and (3) above, the nominal genera *Megasystropha* Lea, 1864, and *Carinifex* Binney, 1865, are objectively identical with one another and the name *Carinifex* Binney is a junior objective synonym of *Megasystropha* Lea.

9. Passing now from the question of the legal position of these names under the *Règles* to the question of the nomenclatorial practice of workers in this field, we find almost unanimous agreement in favour of *Carinifex*. This name has been used in the following works :

Fischer, P. 1883. *Manuel de Conchyliologie* **1** : 508
Tryon, G. W. 1884. *Structural and Systematic Conch.* **3** ; 105

Clessin, S. 1886. "Die Familie der Limniaden." *Syst. Conch. Cab.*
Cooke, A. H. 1895. *Cambridge Natural History* **3** : 439]
Walker, B. 1918. *Misc. Publ. Mus. Zool. Univ. Mich.*, No. 6 : 15, 106
Germain, L. 1923. *Rec. Ind. Mus.* **21** : 188
Wenz, W. 1923. *Fossil. Cat.*, pars 22 : 1671
Pilsbry, H. A. 1926. *Science* **64** : 248
Henderson, J. 1929. *Univ. Colo. Studies* **17** (2) : 143
Chamberlin, R. V., and Jones, D. 1929. *Bull. Univ. Utah* **19** (4) : 155
Thiele, J. 1931. *Handb. der Syst. Weichth.* **1** (2) : 480.

Also, in an unpublished manuscript monograph of this genus by G. Dallas Hanna which I have had the privilege of examining, the name *Carinifex* is used, and H. B. Baker who kindly assisted me by consulting bibliographical references when I first submitted this application to the Commission, also prefers *Carinifex.* Four new species of the genus have been described in the present century, all under the name *Carinifex ;* not one of the specific names has ever been used in combination with the generic name *Megasystropha.* The only authors to use *Megasystropha* at all, so far as I have been able to learn are the following :

Tryon, G. W., Jr. 1870. "Continuation of Haldeman, Monograph of Fresh Water Gastropodes of the United States," : 84
Dall, W. H. *Prof. Paper U.S. gesl. Surv.* No. **132** (G) : 112.

Of these, Tryon published an additional instalment of the same work later in the same year, in which he restored the name *Carinifex* (: 187, 214). Even Lea, the author of the name *Megasystropha*, ultimately abandoned it in favour of Binney's *Carinifex.*

10. For the sake of completeness a misspelling of each of these names should be noted here. Keep (*West Coast shells*, edition of 1893, : 116) used *Carnifex,* the same spelling being used in the index. Further, the pronunciation is indicated so that this seems to be an intentional emendation.

Also Walker (*Synopsis of the Classification of Fresh Water Mollusca of North America, North of Mexico, Univ. of Mich.* Publ. No. 6) uses the spelling *Megastropha* in the text, with the correct orthography in the index. This is clearly a typographical error. The name should be suppressed in such a way as to prevent its ever being used again, as there is a *Megastrophia* Carter 1939 (*Bull. Amer. Paleont.*, **24** : 137 (no. 83, 87)) and the similarity of these two is too close for comfort.

11. In view of the position which the name *Carinifex* has acquired for itself in the literature, its unquestioned use today and the fact that even in the past the name *Megasystropha* was only used on a few scattered occasions, it is clear that the interests of nomenclatorial stability would be promoted and unnecessary confusion avoided, if the Commission would now take such steps as are necessary to confer nomenclatorial availability upon the name *Carinifex* Binney. I accordingly ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature :—

(1) to use its Plenary Powers to suppress the generic names *Carinifex* Binney, 1863 and *Megasystropha* Lea, 1858, for the purpose of the Law of Priority ;

(2) to place on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* the name *Carinifex* Binney, 1865 (gender: feminine) (type species, by subsequent designations of P. Fischer, 1883: *Planorbis newberryi* Lea, 1858);

(3) to place on the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* the specific name *newberryi* Lea, 1858, as published in the binomial combination *Planorbis newberryi*;

(4) to place on the *Official List of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* the following:

Carinifex Binney, 1863
Megasystropha Lea, 1864
Carnifex Keep, 1893
Megastropha Walker, 1918.

COMMENT ON DR. JOSHUA L. BAILY JR.'S PROPOSAL FOR THE VALIDATION OF THE GENERIC NAME " CARINIFEX " BINNEY, 1865 (CLASS GASTROPODA) AND AN ALTERNATIVE PROPOSAL

By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

(Commission's reference: Z.N.(S.)224)

Dr. Joshua L. Baily, Jr. has shown in his application that the generic name *Carinifex* Binney, either as of 1863 or as of 1865, has been widely used in the literature, while its older and valid rival *Megasystropha* Lea, 1864, was not only published in a most unsatisfactory manner, but, in addition, has hardly been used at all.

2. Dr. Baily has therefore, I consider, established a strong case for the use of the Plenary Powers for the purpose of validating the name *Carinifex* Binney. There is however one passage in his paper upon which I feel bound to comment. This is where he seeks to establish the proposition that the Commission was in error when in 1925 in its *Opinion* 87 (*Smithson. misc. Coll.* **73** (No. 3): 21-22) it rejected as not having been duly published for the purposes of Article 25 a paper by Binney, as distributed in 1863 in proof as a projected part of the *Smithsonian miscellaneous Collections*. Further, at the end of his paper Dr. Baily asks the International Commission to use its Plenary Powers for the purpose, *inter alia*, of suppressing the name *Carinifex* Binney, 1863, i.e. for suppressing this name as it appeared in the proof sheet dealt with in *Opinion* 87. While it is easy to criticise the oblique manner in which the Ruling given in *Opinion* 87 was phrased and not difficult also to find defects in some of the arguments used incidentally in the discussion of that case, this, I suggest, is today of no more than historical interest. Equally, it is, I feel, beside the point at this date to traverse again the wisdom of the adverse view taken by the Commission as to the availability of the proof of 1863, though, having regard to the fact (1) that the document in question was issued as an unnumbered proof and (2) that in the preface to this document Professor Henry expressly referred to it as " a mere proof," it is difficult to see how the Commission, when judging this document against the provisions of Article 25, could possibly have taken any view other than that which it did.

3. The only point which arises today is, as it seems to me, whether there are any grounds which would justify the Commission at this time in reversing — or even in re-opening—the decision which it took in this matter nearly thirty years ago, a decision against which no murmur of dissent has till now ever reached the Office of the Commission. My view is that the Commission would be most ill-advised to take any such action. Moreover, as Secretary to the Commission, I take the view that it is irrelevant and inappropriate to raise such an issue incidentally in a case dealing with an individual name. My recommendation is that the Commission should (1) dispose of the general question by placing the Binney proof of 1863 forthwith on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Works in Zoological Nomenclature*, which, as will be recalled, was expressly established by the Fourteenth International Congress of Zoology, Copenhagen, 1953, for the purpose of placing on record in the most formal manner Rulings given by the Commission in *Opinions* either suppressing given books under its Plenary Powers or rejecting given books as invalid under the *Règles* (1953, *Copenhagen Decisions zool. Nomencl.* : 23-24, Decision 23), and (2) deal on its merits with the particular case of the name *Carinifex* Binney, 1865, in the light of (1) above.

4. I accordingly submit for the consideration of the International Commission the following proposal as an alternative to that submitted by Dr. Baily, namely that the Commission should :—

(1) place the under-mentioned work on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Works in Zoological Nomenclature* :—

Binney (W. G.), *Synopsis of the species of Air-breathing Mollusks of North America*, dated 9th December 1863, a document printed on one side of the page and distributed as a proof of a projected and unnumbered part of the *Smithsonian miscellaneous Collections*, bearing the heading " Smithsonian Miscellaneous Collections 000 " (codification of Ruling given in *Opinion* 87) ;

(2) use its Plenary Powers for the purpose of suppressing the generic name *Megasystropha* Lea, 1858, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy ;

(3) place the under-mentioned generic name on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* :—*Carinifex* Binney, 1865 (gender : feminine) (type species, by selection by Fischer (P.) (1883) : *Planorbis newberryi* Lea, 1858) ;

(4) place the under-mentioned specific name on the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* :—*newberryi* Lea, 1858, as published in the combination *Planorbis newberryi* (specific name of type species of *Carinifex* Binney, 1865) ;

(5) place the under-mentioned invalid generic names on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* :—

(*a*) *Carinifex* Binney, 1863 (a name included in a work rejected under (1) above as not having been published for the purposes of Article 25 of the *Règles*);

(*b*) *Megasystropha* Lea, 1864, as suppressed under the Plenary Powers under (2) above ;

(*c*) *Carnifex* Keep, 1893 (an Invalid Subsequent Spelling of *Carinifex* Binney, 1865) ;

(*d*) *Megastropha* Walker, 1918 (an Invalid Subsequent Spelling of *Megasystropha* Lea, 1864).

5. *Postscript :* Dr. Baily has informed me (*in litt.*, 13th October, 1954) that the generic name *Carinifex* has not been taken as the basis for a family-group name. Accordingly, no question arises of placing such a name on the *Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology*.

PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO VALIDATE THE FAMILY-GROUP NAME " XANTHINAE " DANA, 1851 (CLASS CRUSTACEA, ORDER DECAPODA)

By FRANCIS HEMMING C.M.G. C.B.E.

(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

(Commission's reference : Z.N.(S.)601)

The decision by the Fourteenth International Congress of Zoology Copenhagen, 1953 to establish an *Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology* and to apply to that *List* regulations corresponding with those prescribed for the *Official Lists* previously established makes it necessary to examine applications submitted prior to the Copenhagen Congress for the purpose of determining whether any problem relating to family-group names is involved therein. The present application is concerned with the family-group name based upon the name of the nominal genus *Xantho* Leach , 1814 (Class Crustacea,Order Decapoda), a proposal relating to which has been submitted to the Commission by Dr. L. B. Holthuis (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The Netherlands*). This application has recently been published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* (Holthuis, 1954, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **9** : 270-271). The present application has been written in close consultation with Dr. Holthuis and has his full support.

2. Dr. Holthuis' application commences with a reference to the family XANTHIDAE, and, in order to complete the action required in this case (under the Copenhagen Congress's decision referred to above), I recently applied to Dr. Holthuis, both for the reference for the place where the present family-group name was originally published and, also, for any other information regarding this family-group name, of which it would be necessary to take account in submitting this case to the Commission. The following is an extract from the reply (dated 27th September 1954) which I received from Dr. Holthuis :—

Extract from a letter dated 27th September 1954 from Dr. L. B. Holthuis

Family name based on " Xantho "

1. The reference to the original publication of the family XANTHIDAE is the following : XANTHINAE Dana, 1851, *Amer. J. Sci.* (2) **12** : 123, 124 (type genus : *Xantho* Leach, 1814).

2. There is a difficulty with this family name, because it is a more recent name than that of PILUMNIDAE Samouelle, 1819, *Entomologist's useful Compendium* : 86 (type genus : *Pilumnus* Leach, 1815, *Trans. Linn. Soc. Lond.* **11** : 321), a genus placed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* in *Opinion* 85), for the genera *Xantho* Leach, 1814, and *Pilumnus* Leach, 1815, are currently considered to belong in the same family. Since the name XANTHIDAE is used for this family by practically all carcinologists, while the name PILUMNIDAE is ignored by them, it will be in the interest of nomenclatorial stability to have the name XANTHIDAE and not that of PILUMNIDAE placed on the *Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology*.

3. It appears clear from Dr. Holthuis' letter that the interests of stability and universality in zoological nomenclature require that the family group name XANTHIDAE should be preserved. The question for consideration is therefore the nature of the action required to secure this end. The difficulty to be resolved in this case arises from the fact that the genus *Xantho* Leach, 1814, was not made the type genus of a family-group until 1851 (when a subfamily XANTHINAE was erected by Dana), whereas the genus *Pilumnus* Leach, 1815, a genus currently regarded as belonging to the same family as *Xantho* Leach had been taken as the type genus of a family-group many years previously by Samouelle who in 1819 erected the family PILUMNIDAE. The Copenhagen Congress, when revising the former (totally inadequate) provisions regarding family-group names, laid it down, that subject to the grant of relief in particular cases the principle of priority is to apply as between any two rival family-group names. In the present case therefore under the foregoing provision the family name PILUMNIDAE Samouelle, 1819, would take priority over the family name XANTHIDAE (ranking as from Dana, 1851).

4. The Copenhagen Congress recognised that the extension of the priority principle to family-group names, coupled with the provision that all family-group names having a given genus as type genus are co-ordinate with one another, might lead to undesirable name-changing, unless measures were taken to prevent this from happening. The Congress accordingly inserted in the *Règles* a provision (1953, *Copenhagen Decisions zool. Nomencl.* : 33, Decision 45) authorising taxonomists to set aside priority in this field in cases where, in their opinion, " priority is in conflict with current usage," provided that an author taking such action sends a notification regarding it to the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature.* Action so taken by a taxonomist becomes valid provisionally upon the publication of the foregoing notification. It becomes definitive however only if during the ensuing two years no protest against the action so taken is lodged with the International Commission. Where a protest is so lodged, the final decision is to be taken by the Commission. The procedure described above offers conveniences in those cases where an immediate decision is not essential. In other cases, the desired end can be secured by the use by the Commission of its Plenary Powers, those Powers being applicable to every provision in the *Règles.* In the present instance the General Directives issued to the Commission by the International Congress of Zoology (1) that every *Opinion* rendered by it must deal with all parts of the subject submitted and (2) that, whenever there is placed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* a name of a genus which is the type genus of a family-group, appropriate action in relation to the *Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology* is to be taken by the Commission, make it necessary to have resort to the Plenary Powers procedure.

5. The recommendation now submitted is that, in the interests of stability and universality in nomenclature at the family-name level, the Commission should :—

(1) use its Plenary Powers to suppress the family-group name PILUMNIDAE Samouelle, 1819 (type genus : *Pilumnus* Leach, 1815) for the

purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy ;

(2) place the family-group name XANTHINAE Dana, 1851 (type genus : *Xantho* Leach, 1814) on the *Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology* ;

(3) place the family-group name PILUMNIDAE Samouelle, 1819, as suppressed under the Plenary Powers under (1) above, on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family-Group Names in Zoology.*

PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO VALIDATE THE GENERIC NAME "DISCIAS" RATHBUN, 1902 (CLASS CRUSTACEA, ORDER DECAPODA)

By L. B. HOLTHUIS

(*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The Netherlands*)

(Commission's reference: Z.N.(S.)829)

In 1902 Miss M. J. Rathbun (*Proc. Wash. Acad. Sci.* **4**: 290) described a genus *Discias* from the Galapagos Islands and made it the type of a new family that she named DISCIDAE, but that at present more correctly is generally called DISCIADIDAE. After the original publication of this name by Rathbun, four more species of the genus were discovered, two in the Atlantic, and two in the Indo-West-Pacific region. Though the published records of these animals are rather few (because of their small size they probably have often been overlooked), the genus is well known to carcinologists because of its very peculiar features.

2. In 1893 Ortmann (*Ergebn. Plankton Exped.* **2**(Gb) : 74) described from the Atlantic Ocean a larval Macruran, which he named *Anisocaris dromedarius*, erecting a monotypic new genus for it. Gurney's (1939, *Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.* (11) **3** : 388-393) and Lebour's (1941, *J. linn. Soc. Lond.*(Zool.) **41** : 95-102) researches on larval Decapoda made it clear that *Anisocaris dromedarius* Ortmann, 1893, is the larva of a species of *Discias* Rathbun, 1902. A strict application of the International Rules of Zoological Nomenclature would require that the generic name *Discias* should be replaced by that of *Anisocaris*. The identity of the species *Anisocaris dromedarius* is not known, it may be the larva of either of the two Atlantic *Discias* species, but might as well be the larva of a species of which the adult form is still unknown.

3. In view of the fact (1) that the name *Discias* has become firmly established in carcinological literature, (2) that the name *Anisocaris* has hardly ever been used, and has never been employed for adult specimens, and (3) that it is undesirable that the family DISCIADIDAE should not contain a genus bearing the name *Discias*, the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature is hereby asked :—

(1) to use its Plenary Powers :—

- (*a*) to suppress for the purposes of the Law of Priority, but not for those of the Law of Homonymy the generic name *Anisocaris* Ortmann, 1893 (*Ergebn. Plankton Exped.* **2** (Gb) : 72, 74) (type species, by monotypy : *Anisocaris dromedarius* Ortmann, 1893, *Ergebn. Plankton Exped.* **2** (Gb) : 74) ;
- (*b*) to validate the generic name *Discias* Rathbun, 1902 (*Proc. Wash. Acad. Sci.*, **4** : 290) (type species, by monotypy : *Discias serrifer* Rathbun, 1902, *Proc. Wash. Acad. Sci.*, **4**: 290) (gender: masculine) ;

(2) to place on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* the name *Discias* Rathbun, 1902, as validated under (1) (*b*) above ;

(3) to place on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* the name *Anisocaris* Ortmann, 1893, as suppressed under (1) (*a*) above ;

(4) to place on the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* the specific name *serrifer* Rathbun, 1902, as published in the binomen *Discias serrifer ;*

(5) to place on the *Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology* the name DISCIADIDAE (correction by Kemp (1920, *Rec. ind. Mus.* **19** : 137, 138) of DISCIDAE) Rathbun, 1902 (*Proc. Wash. Acad. Sci.* **4** : 289) (type genus : *Discias* Rathbun, 1902) ;

(6) to place on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family-Group Names in Zoology* the under-mentioned names :—

(*a*) DISCIDAE Rathbun, 1902 (an Invalid Original Spelling for DISCIADIDAE) ;

(*b*) DISCIIDAE Lebour, 1949 (*Proc. zool. Soc. Lond.* **118** (4) : 1107) (an Erroneous Subsequent Spelling for DISCIADIDAE).

PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO VALIDATE THE GENERIC NAMES "UPOGEBIA" LEACH, 1814, AND "PROCESSA" LEACH, 1815 (CLASS CRUSTACEA, ORDER DECAPODA)

By L. B. HOLTHUIS

(*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The Netherlands*)

(Commission's reference: Z.N.(S.)830)

The purpose of the present application is to ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to use its Plenary Powers in order to suppress two long-forgotten generic names which are senior synonyms of two well-known names that have been, and still are, widely used in the literature dealing with macrurous Decapod Crustacea.

2. The original references for the generic names cited in the present application are the following :

Callianassa Leach, 1814, Brewster's *Edinburgh Ency.* **7** (2) : 400 (gender : feminine) (type species, by monotypy : *Cancer* (*Astacus*) *subterraneus* Montagu, 1808 (*Trans. linn. Soc. Lond.* **9** : 88) ;

Calypso Risso, 1816, *Hist. nat. Crust. Nice* : 74 (gender : feminine) (type species, by monotypy : *Calypso periculosa* Risso, 1816, *Hist. nat. Crust. Nice* : 74 (= *Cancer strigosus* Linnaeus, 1761, *Fauna svec.* (ed.2) : 495) ;

Egeon Bosc, 1813, *Nouv. Bull. Sci. Soc. philomat. Paris* **3** (66) : 233 (gender : masculine) (type species, by monotypy: *Cancer cataphractus* Olivi, 1792, *Zool. adriat.* : 50). (an invalid junior homonym of *Egeon* de Montfort, 1808 (*Conchyl. syst.* **1** : 166) ;

Egeon Risso, 1816, *Hist. nat. Crust. Nice* : 99 (gender : masculine) (type species, by monotypy : *Egeon loricatus* Risso, 1816, *Hist. nat. Crust. Nice* : 100 (= *Cancer cataphractus* Olivi, 1792, *Zool. adriat.* 50) an invalid junior homonym of *Egeon* de Montfort, 1808) ;

Galathea Fabricius, 1793, *Ent. syst.* **2** : 471 (gender : feminine) (type species, selected by Latreille, 1810 (*Consid. gén.. Crust. Arachn. Ins.* : 422) : *Cancer strigosus* Linnaeus, 1761, *Fauna svec.* (ed. 2) : 495) ;

Gebia Leach, 1815, *Trans. linn. Soc. Lond.* **11** : 342 (gender : feminine) (type species, selected by Fowler, 1912 (*Ann. Rep. New Jersey State Mus.* **1911** : 361) : *Cancer* (*Astacus*) *stellatus* Montagu, 1808, *Trans. linn. Soc. Lond.* **9** : 89) (a junior objective synonym of *Upogebia* Leach, 1814) ;

Gebios Risso, 1822, *J. Phys. Chim. Hist. nat. Arts* **95** : 243 (gender : feminine) (type species, by monotypy : *Gebios davianus* Risso, 1822, *J. Phys. Chim. Hist. nat. Arts.* Paris **95** : 243 (= *Astacus tyrrhenus* Petagna, 1792, *Institut. entom.* : 418) ;

Gerbios Bosc, 1813, *Nouv. Bull. Sci. Soc. philomat. Paris* **3** (66) : 233 (gender : feminine) (type species, by present selection : *Thalassina littoralis* Risso, 1816, *Hist. nat. Crust. Nice* : 76 (= *Astacus pusillus* Petagna, 1792, *Institut. entom.* : 418) ;

Janira Risso, 1816, *Hist. nat. Crust. Nice* : 175 (gender : feminine) (substitute name for *Calypso* Risso, 1816, *Hist. nat. Crust. Nice* : 74) (an invalid junior homonym of *Janira* Leach, 1814) ;

Melia Bosc, 1813, *Nouv. Bull. Sci. Soc. philomat. Paris* **3** (66) : 233 (gender : feminine) (type species, by present selection : *Calypso periculosa* Risso, 1816, *Hist. nat. Crust. Nice* : 74 (=*Cancer strigosus* Linnaeus, 1761, *Fauna svec.* (ed. 2) : 495) ;

Nika Risso, 1816, *Hist. nat. Crust. Nice* : 84 (gender : feminine) (type species, by selection by H. Milne Edwards, 1837 (Cuvier's *Règne anim.* ed. 4, Disciples' Ed.) **18** : pl. 52 fig. 1) : *Nika edulis* Risso, 1816, *Hist. nat. Crust. Nice* : 85) ;

Processa Leach, 1815, *Malac. podophth. Brit.* (4) : explanation of pl. 41 (gender : feminine) (type species, by monotypy : *Processa canaliculata* Leach, 1815, *Malac. podophth. Brit.* (4) : explanation of pl. 41) ;

Thalassalpes Bosc, 1813, *Nouv. Bull. Sci. Soc. philomat. Paris* **3** (66) : 233 gender : masculine) (type species, by present selection : *Nika edulis* Risso, 1816, *Hist. nat. Crust. Nice* : 85) ;

Thalassina Latreille, 1806, *Gen. Crust. Ins.* **1** : 51 (gender : feminine) (type species, by monotypy : *Thalassina scorpionides* Latreille, 1806, *Gen. Crust. Ins.* **1** : 52 (= *Cancer* (*Astacus*) *anomalus* Herbst, 1804, *Vers. Naturgesch. Krabben Krebse* **3** (4) : 45) ;

Upogebia Leach, 1814, Brewster's *Edinburgh Ency.* **7** (2) : 400 (gender : feminine) (type species, by monotypy : *Cancer* (*Astacus*) *stellatus* Montagu, 1808, *Trans. linn. Soc. Lond.* **9** : 89).

3. In March 1813 (in *Nouv. Bull. Sci. Soc. philomat. Paris* **3** (66) : 233, 234) a paper was published, entitled " Essai historique sur les Crustacés de la mer de Nice, par M. Rizzo. (Extrait d'un rapport fait à l'Institut par M. Bosc.) " As is shown by its title this publication is an extract of a report by L. A. G. Bosc on a manuscript submitted by A. Risso (the spelling Rizzo is incorrect) to the Institut de France. Bosc must therefore be regarded as the author of the foregoing publication. In this paper four new genera (*Gerbios*, *Melia*, *Thalassalpes*, and *Egeon*) are mentioned and briefly characterised. Though the genera evidently were originally proposed by Risso in his manuscript, the brief characterisations (which hardly can be given the name of definitions) are clearly made by Bosc in his own words ; there is no indication whatsoever that they have been made by Risso. Though it does not seem very fair, we must, I believe, treat Bosc as the author of these names. That this question is difficult is shown by the way in which the authorship of these four generic names is treated in Neave's *Nomenclator Zoologicus*, where the author of two of the names (*Egeon* and *Thalassalpes*) is given as " Risso," of one (*Gerbios*) as " Bosc," while of the fourth (*Melia*) the author is indicated as " Bosc in Risso."

4. In 1816 Risso published his manuscript referred to above as a book under the title *Histoire naturelle des Crustacés des environs de Nice.* In this book the author used only one of the four generic names mentioned by Bosc (1813), namely, *Egeon*, which is treated by Risso as a name for a new genus. The name *Calypso* was used by Risso instead of that of *Melia*, probably because, as Bosc had pointed out in his 1813 paper, the name *Melia* has already been used for a genus of plants ; in an *Erratum* in his 1816 publication Risso substituted the name *Janira* for *Calpyso*, because the latter name " ayant déjà employé par les Naturalistes " (again for a genus of plants). Bosc's (1813) remark that *Gerbios* " paraît infiniment se rapprocher des thalassines de Latreille " probably made Risso (1816) abandon his name *Gerbios* and use *Thalassina* Latreille, 1806, instead. For unknown reasons Risso (1816) substituted the name *Nika* for that of *Thalassalpes.* It is evident that Risso did not consider the four generic names mentioned in Bosc's (1813) paper as validly published. In any case he entirely ignored Bosc's publication.

5. The name *Egeon* Bosc, 1813, as well as *Egeon* Risso, 1816, is invalid, since it is preoccupied by the older generic name *Egeon* de Montfort, 1808. The names *Melia* Bosc, 1813, *Calypso* Risso, 1816, and *Janira* Risso, 1816, are objective synonyms of one another. They are based on an old figure of Rondelet's which represents *Galathea strigosa* (L.) ; Bosc's and Risso's three generic names thus are junior (subjective) synonyms of *Galathea* Fabricius, 1793, a genus of which *Galathea strigosa* is the type species.

6. Bosc's (1813) two other generic names *Thalassalpes* and *Gerbios*, however, prove to be the oldest available names for the genera concerned. *Thalassalpes* was very briefly characterised by Bosc : " n' a de pinces qu' à une des pattes antérieures." This single character, however, is sufficient to distinguish the genus from all other European genera. Bosc does not name any species as belonging in his genus *Thalassalpes*, but since the latter is obviously identical with *Nika* Risso, 1816, the type species of the latter genus, *Nika edulis* Risso, 1816, should be regarded also as the type species of the former, and it is so selected here. In carcinological literature two different names have been regularly used for this genus. These two names are *Processa* Leach, 1815, and *Nika* Risso, 1816. The former name has been used by at least 64 authors (by 44 of these in papers published since 1914), the latter name by at least 114 authors (by about 22 of these in papers published since 1914). The name *Processa*, being the older of the two, has been generally accepted in modern literature and during the last forty years has been used by all specialists in the group. The name *Thalassalpes* Bosc, on the other hand, has been completely overlooked, and I do not know of a single author having used it since the original publication by Bosc in 1813. A substitution of the name *Thalassalpes* for *Processa* would greatly upset carcinological nomenclature and a suppression of the former name is, in my opinion, fully justified,

7. The case of the name *Gerbios* is very similar to that of *Thalassalpes*. Bosc's description of the genus *Gerbios* is very short, but makes it sufficiently clear that it is based on the species that Risso later (in 1816) described as *Thalassina littoralis*, and which at present is known as *Upogebia pusilla* (Petagna, 1792). The generic name *Gerbios* Bosc, 1813, thus becomes a senior (subjective) synonym of the name *Upogebia* Leach, 1814. For the genus in question several names have been used : (1) The oldest available name, *Gerbios* Bosc, 1813, as far as is known to me, has been used only by the original author. (2) The name *Upogebia* Leach, 1814, at present is currently adopted in carcinological literature. (3) The name *Gebia* Leach, 1815 a junior objective synonym of *Upogebia* Leach, 1814, during the previous century was practically exclusively used to indicate the present genus ; later it was replaced more and more by the name *Upogebia*, while at present it is employed by very few authors only. It was Stebbing (1893, *Hist. Crust.* : 185) who first pointed out that the name *Upogebia* has priority over *Gebia*, and he consequently adopted the former of the two names. In this he was almost immediately followed by the majority of carcinologists and at present the name *Upogebia* has become firmly established. Judging by an unpublished bibliography which I have been preparing during the last few years, at least 100 authors used the name *Gebia* before 1900, and less than 5 authors during that period employed the name *Upogebia*. After 1920 more than 80 authors have used the name *Upogebia*, and about 15 that of *Gebia* (practically none of the latter being a specialist in Crustacea). In my opinion, stability of carcinological nomenclature would be greatly furthered by the suppression of the practically unknown generic name *Gerbios* and by the validation of the widely used name *Upogebia*.

8. The position of the generic name *Gebios* Risso, 1822, which generally is considered to be synonymous with *Upogebia* Leach should also be discussed here. Risso (1822 : 243) when using the name *Gebios* for the first time, included two species in it. One of these is the new species *Gebios davianus*, the other was not cited by name, but it was evidently *Thalassina littoralis* Risso, 1816, since it was referred to as the species which in Risso's *Hist. nat. Crust. Nice* (1816) had been placed in the genus *Thalassina* Latreille. As *Gebios daviana* Risso, 1822, was the only nominal species assigned to *Gebios* in the original publication of that name, it becomes its type species by monotypy. Since *Gebios daviana* doubtless is identical with the species known at present under the name *Callianassa tyrrhena* (Petagna, 1792), the generic name *Gebios* Risso, 1822, becomes a junior subjective synonym of the name *Callianassa* Leach, 1814. It is possible that in using the name *Gebios*, Risso actually intended to restore the old genus *Gerbios*, but this cannot be proved.

9. The only two names that form a menace to the stability of the nomenclature of the taxa discussed in the present application thus are *Gerbios* Bosc, 1813, and *Thalassalpes* Bosc, 1813, for which reason their suppression is requested.

10. The present opportunity is used to propose the insertion in the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* of the generic names *Callianassa*, *Galathea* and *Thalassina* mentioned above. I have convinced myself that these three names are available in so far that they are not junior homonyms of other generic names in zoology. Furthermore, they have been in general use in carcinological literature almost from the moment that they were first published, and their position has remained unchallenged throughout. All three are the names of type genera of well-known families and two of them (*Galathea* and *Thalassina*) are even the type genera of supra-familial groups. The insertion of these names in the *Official List* is therefore fully justified.

11. The genus *Upogebia* Leach, 1814, is currently considered the type of the sub-family UPOGEBIINAE Borradaile, 1903. An older name for this sub-family is GEBIINAE (correction of GEBIDAE) Dana, 1852. As the name UPOGEBIINAE is at present generally used, while its older objective synonym is not accepted, it seems advisable to me to place the name UPOGEBIINAE on the *Official List* and GEBIINAE on the *Official Index of Family-Group Names*. A similar case is offered by the family name PROCESSIDAE Ortmann, 1896. This name possesses two older, but subjective, synonyms, namely NIKIDAE Bate, 1888 (*Rep. Voy. Challenger, Zool.* **24** : xii, xli, 480, 503) (type genus *Nika* Risso, 1816 (*Hist. nat. Crust. Nice :* 84) and HECTARTHROPIDAE Bate, 1888 (*Rep. Voy. Challenger, Zool.* **24** : 481, 883) (type genus *Hectarthropus* Bate, 1888 (*Rep. Voy. Challenger, Zool.* **24** : 889)). The genera *Nika* Risso, 1816, and *Hectarthropus* Bate, 1888, are subjective junior synonyms of *Processa* Leach, 1814. As the name PROCESSIDAE is widely used, while those of NIKIDAE and HECTARTHROPIDAE have been almost completely forgotten, I consider that it is advisable to give the name PROCESSIDAE Ortmann, 1896, priority over the names NIKIDAE Bate, 1888 and HECTARTHROPIDAE Bate, 1888, notwithstanding the fact that the latter are older. For this reason the insertion in the *Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology* of the name PROCESSIDAE has been requested.

12. The concrete proposals which I now submit for consideration are that the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature should :—

(1) use its Plenary Powers :—
  (*a*) to suppress the undermentioned generic names for the purposes of the Law of Priority, but not for those of the Law of Homonymy :—
    (i) *Gerbios* Bosc, 1813 ;
    (ii) *Thalassalpes* Bosc, 1813 ;
  (*b*) to validate the undermentioned generic names :—
    (i) *Upogebia* Leach, 1814 ;
    (ii) *Processa* Leach, 1815 ;

(2) place on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* the undermentioned generic names with the type species and gender specified in paragraph 2 of the present application :—
  (*a*) *Callianassa* Leach, 1814 ;
  (*b*) *Galathea* Fabricius, 1793 ;
  (*c*) *Processa* Leach, 1815, as validated under (1) (*b*) (ii) above ;
  (*d*) *Thalassina* Latreille, 1806 ;
  (*e*) *Upogebia* Leach, 1814, as validated under (1) (*b*) (i) above ;

(3) place on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* the under-mentioned generic names :—
   - (*a*) *Calypso* Risso, 1816 (an objective junior synonym of *Melia* Bosc, 1813) ;
   - (*b*) *Egeon* Bosc, 1813 (a junior homonym of *Egeon* de Montfort, 1808) ;
   - (*c*) *Egeon* Risso, 1816 (a junior homonym of *Egeon* de Montfort, 1808) ;
   - (*d*) *Gebia* Leach, 1815 (a junior objective synonym of *Upogebia* Leach, 1814) ;
   - (*e*) *Gerbios* Bosc, 1813, as suppressed under (1) (*a*) (i) above ;
   - (*f*) *Janira* Risso, 1816 (a junior objective synonym of *Melia* Bosc, 1813, and a junior homonym of *Janira* Leach, 1814) ;
   - (*g*) *Thalassalpes* Bosc, 1813, as suppressed under (1) (*a*) (ii) above ;

(4) place on the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* the under-mentioned specific names :—
   - (*a*) *anomalus* Herbst, 1804, as published in the combination *Cancer* (*Astacus*) *anomalus* ;
   - (*b*) *canaliculata* Leach, 1815, as published in the combination *Processa canaliculata* ;
   - (*c*) *stellatus* Montagu, 1808, as published in the combination *Cancer* (*Astacus*) *stellatus* ;
   - (*d*) *strigosus* Linnaeus, 1761, as published in the combination *Cancer strigosus* ;
   - (*e*) *subterraneus* Montagu, 1808, as published in the combination *Cancer* (*Astacus*) *subterraneus;*

(5) place on the *Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology* the under-mentioned family-group names :—
   - (*a*) CALLIANASSIDAE Dana, 1852, *Proc. Acad. nat. Sci. Philad.* **6** : 12, 14, 19 (type genus : *Callianassa* Leach, 1814) ;
   - (*b*) GALATHEIDAE (correction by White, 1847 (*List Crust. Brit. Mus.* : 65) of GALATEADAE) Samouelle, 1819 (*Entomologist's useful Compendium* : 92 (type genus : *Galathea* Fabricius, 1793) ;
   - (*c*) PROCESSIDAE Ortmann, 1896, *Zool. Jb. Syst.* **9** : 415, 424 (type genus : *Processa* Leach, 1815) ;
   - (*d*) THALASSINIDAE (correction by White, 1847 (*List Crust. Brit. Mus.* : 70) of THALASSINIDES) Latreille, 1831, *Cours d'Entomol.*: 377) (type genus : *Thalassina* Latreille, 1806);
   - (*e*) UPOGEBIINAE Borradaile, 1903, *Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.* (7) **12** : 542 (type genus : *Upogebia* Leach, 1814) ;

(6) place on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family-Group Names in Zoology* the undermentioned names :—
   - (*a*) GALATEADAE Samouelle, 1819, *Entomologist's useful Compendium* : 92 (an Invalid Original Spelling for GALATHEIDAE) ;

(*b*) GEBIIDAE (correction by Miers (1876, *Catal. Crust. New Zealand*: 70) of GEBIDAE) Dana, 1852, *Proc. Acad. nat. Sci. Philad.* **6**: 12, 13, 19 (type genus: *Gebia* Leach, 1815) (a family-group name, the type species, *Cancer* (*Astacus*) *stellatus* Montagu, 1808, of which is also the type species of *Upogebia* Leach, 1814 (a name proposed under (2) (*e*) above, to be placed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*), which is the type genus of the sub-family UPOGEBIINAE Borradaile, 1903, proposed, under (5) (*e*) above, to be placed on the *Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology*;

(*c*) GEBIDAE Dana, 1852, *Proc. Acad. nat. Sci. Philad.* **6**: 12, 13, 19 (an Invalid Original Spelling of GEBIIDAE).

(*d*) THALASSINIDES Latreille, 1831, *Cours d'Entomol.*: 377 (an Invalid Original Spelling for THALASSINIDAE).

PROPOSED VALIDATION, UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS, OF THE FAMILY-GROUP NAMES "PROCESSIDAE" AND "UPOGEBIINAE" (CLASS CRUSTACEA, ORDER DECAPODA)

By FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

(Commission's reference: Z.N.(S.)830)

The present application, which is concerned with the proposed validation of the family-group names PROCESSIDAE Ortmann, 1896, and UPOGEBIINAE Borrodaile, 1903 (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda), is in the nature of a supplement to the proposal by Dr. L. B. Holthuis (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The Netherlands*) that these family-group names should be placed on the *Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology*. It is concerned only with the question of the procedure required to give effect to Dr. Holthuis' proposal.

2. In a note on a similar problem which arises in connection with the family-group name XANTHINAE Dana, 1851 (Hemming, 1954, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **9** : 329-331) I have explained how, when the Fourteenth International Congress of Zoology, Copenhagen, 1953, decided to insert in the *Règles* a provision applying the priority principle to family-group names, it realised that, unless mitigated in some simple manner, this decision would be likely to give rise to undesirable name-changing. The Congress accordingly inserted in the *Règles* a provision under which, subject to the compliance with a simple procedure, an author who considers that in any given case the application of priority is " in conflict with current usage " may set aside priority in the case concerned (1953, *Copenhagen Decisions zool. Nomencl.* : 33, Decision 54 (1)). Action so taken is liable to challenge and in any case does not become definitively valid for a period of two years. This procedure offers certain conveniences but it is not appropriate in cases where the question of a family-group name arises in connection with an application for a given generic name to be placed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, for, under the Regulations governing the *Official Lists*, the Commission is required in such a case to take account also of the position at the family-group level. Accordingly, in such cases, it is necessary to have resort to the Plenary Powers procedure, in order to secure the desired stability in family-group nomenclature.

3. Dr. Holthuis has explained (Holthuis, 1954, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **9** : 338) that the well-known family name PROCESSIDAE Ortmann, 1896, is a junior subjective synonym both of NIKIDAE Bate, 1888, and of HECTARTHROPIDAE Bate, 1888, while the UPOGEBIINAE Borrodaile, 1903, is a junior objective synomym of the family name GEBIDAE Dana, 1852. In each of these cases Dr. Holthuis proposes that, owing to the conflict of the principle of priority with current usage, the junior synonym currently in use should be accepted. For the reasons which have been explained in paragraph 2 above, this end can be attained in the present case only by the suppression of the senior synonyms under the Plenary Powers.

4. It is accordingly proposed that in the interest of maintaining current usage at the family-group-name level (as enjoined by the Copenhagen Congress) the International Commission should use its Plenary Powers to suppress the under-mentioned family-group names for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy :—(*a*) NIKIDAE Bate, 1888 (type genus : *Nika* Risso, 1816) ; (*b*) HECTARTHROPIDAE Bate, 1888 (type genus ; *Hectarthropus* Bate, 1888) ; (*c*) GEBIDAE Dana, 1852 (type genus : *Gebia* Leach, 1815). Dr. Holthuis has already asked that the name GEBIDAE Dana, 1852, be placed on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family-Group Names in Zoology*. Similar action should now be taken as regards the two other names dealt with in the present application.

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED VALIDATION UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS OF "IMMIGRANS" STURTEVANT, 1921, AS PUBLISHED IN THE COMBINATION "DROSOPHILA IMMIGRANS" (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER DIPTERA)

By ROY A. HARRISON
(*Entomologist, Plant Diseases Division, Department of Scientific and Industrial Research, Auckland, New Zealand*)

(Commission's reference : Z.N.(S.)711)

(Enclosure to a letter dated 13th August 1954)

(For the proposal submitted in this case, see *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **9** : 161-162)

The application should be considered only in the light of the well-known and common usage of the name *immigrans* Sturtevant. All references in the application directed at raising doubt as to the identity of the species to which the name *brouni* Hutton is applied, are irrelevant and are commented on below.

2. *Comment on Para.* 2 *in Z.N.*(*S.*)711 : The synonymy of *immigrans* Sturtevant with *brouni* Hutton is established just as firmly as are the majority of synonyms published in modern taxonomic literature. For a synonymy to be unequivocally established implies that both the populations under consideration must be shown in actual fact to be interfertile—a set of circumstances rarely possible to prove and more rarely asked for.

3. *Comment on Para.* 3 *in Z.N.*(*S.*)711 : The original description of *Drosophila brouni* Hutton is not taxonomically worthless particularly as regards the genus. Hutton described the species as a member of the genus *Drosophila*. The ability or otherwise of Hutton to recognise a member of the genus *Drosophila* is, of course, not under consideration. However, that Hutton was correct in placing *brouni* in the genus *Drosophila* is substantiated by Harrison (1952, *Trans. Roy. Soc. N.Z.* **79** : 514-515).

4. *Comment on Para.* 4 *in Z.N.*(S.)711 : There is as yet no published evidence which shows that females in the *immigrans* group of species cannot be distinguished by means of a study of external characters. If, as is stated in para. 7 of Z.N.(S.)711 *Drosophila immigrans* Sturtevant will possibly be found to consist of several sibling species, it is entirely probable that with further conscientious study some differences of external morphological characters will be discovered for the separation of such species as has been done, for example, with the sibling species *Drosophila pseudoobscura* Frolova and *Drosophila persimilis* Dobzhansky and Epling. A museum specimen is of necessity dried and pinned and its age is of no concern.

5. *Comment on Para.* 5 *in Z.N.*(*S.*)711 : This paragraph is irrelevant.

6. *Comment on Para.* 6 *in Z.N.*(*S.*)711 : It is nowhere stated in published literature that because recent *immigrans* material collected in New Zealand has produced fertile offspring with U.S. *immigrans* that the synonymy of *brouni* and *immigrans* is established. In collections made over the last 15 years in the Auckland area no other member of the *immigrans* group has been discovered. The type specimen of *Drosophila brouni* Hutton was taken in Auckland which even 50 years ago was a city of no mean state and as such offered the domestic habitats suitable for *Drosophila immigrans* exactly as it does at the present time.

7. Sturtevant, A. H. (1921, *Carnegie Inst. Wash., publ.* **301** : 84) in commenting on his description of *Drosophila immigrans* sp. nov., states: " It will not be surprising if an earlier name, applied in some other region, is discovered." Thus, there was doubt as to the real identity of *Drosophila immigrans* at the time of its original description and it is unfortunate that the position was not clarified in 1921 or soon afterwards.

8. In conclusion I wish to state that in the interests of stability of zoological nomenclature, I agree that *brouni* should be suppressed in favour of *immigrans* on the basis of the well-known and common usage of the name *immigrans* over the last thirty or more years. However, I wish to reiterate that the application should be judged on this aspect alone, and that the other arguments in the application aimed at raising doubts as to the correctness of the synonymy of *brouni* and *immigrans* are irrelevant.

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED VALIDATION UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS OF "IMMIGRANS" STURTEVANT, 1921, AS PUBLISHED IN THE COMBINATION "DROSOPHILA IMMIGRANS" (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER DIPTERA)

By E. B. BASDEN
(*Institute of Animal Genetics, Edinburgh 9, Scotland*)

(Commission's reference: Z.N.(S.)711)

(Enclosure to a letter dated 11th September 1954)

The group of *Drosophila* to which *immigrans* belongs has not yet been monographed (*vide* paras. 5, 7 *in* Mayr *et al.*, 1954, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **9** (6): 161-162). Therefore, it would be premature for the Commission to express an opinion before this has been done.

2. The ♀ type specimen of *D. brouni* Hutton (para. 4) and ♀ " gonotype " specimens of *D. immigrans* are *in existence*. Therefore, these should be critically compared side by side by a competent independent observer. " Comparison with the type " is a fundamental precept in taxonomy, yet it appears this has not been done in this case, i.e. the two-type series have not been compared.

3. If a reliable difference is discovered, then *D. brouni* and *D. immigrans* can be considered distinct and a ruling by the Commission will not be required.

4. If such a difference is not discovered, then

(*a*) the two names are synonyms for one species ;

(*b*) the two names represent two distinct species, that are visually indistinguishable in the ♀ sex (para. 4).

5. If no difference is found, and since 4 (*b*) applies (para. 4), and since there may be sibling (i.e. visually indistinguishable) species of *D. immigrans* (para. 7)—then it cannot be proved that *D. immigrans* is the same as or different from *D. brouni*. In such a case it would be incorrect to sink one species as a synonym of the other or to (para. 9 (1)) suppress the name *brouni* Hutton, 1901.

6. If, however, it be considered that *D. brouni* and *D. immigrans* are the same species, I do not see any valid reason why the name *D. brouni* should not replace the name *D. immigrans*. *D. immigrans* is well known in entomological and genetic literature but it is only of recent (33 years) introduction. The law of priority should not be spurned after this relatively short period. No name that floods the literature should be allowed automatically to supersede an older, lesser-known name, because of an oversight in systematic work ; provided that a reasonable period of years has not elapsed. I do not think this reasonable period has elapsed in this case. Credit is due to systematists who rectify such oversights. Sturtevant himself,

Bull. zool. Nomencl., Vol. 9, Part 11. December 1954.

after his description of *D. immigrans* (1921, The North American species of Drosophila *Carneg. Instit. Washington*, Publ. No. 301 : 84) writes that it will not be surprising if an earlier name, applied in some other region, is discovered. This probably has now been accomplished by Harrison (1952, New Zealand Drosophilidae (Diptera), *Tr. Proc. Roy. Soc. N.Z.*, **79** (3) : 514). Future published reference to the species as " *D. brouni* Hutton (=*D. immigrans* Sturtevant) " for a period of two or three years would remove any inconvenience or confusion caused by the change of name.

7. The labelling of a group of *Drosophila*, e.g. *immigrans*-group (para. 7), is a purely convenient and arbitrary affair and cannot be accepted as type designation. The change to " *brouni*-group," or to any other name, would not affect scientific research in the least. In fact, the name *brouni*, originating from New Zealand, would not be ill-fitting for the group, for it is stated (Patterson and Stone, 1952, *Evolution in the Genus Drosophila*, Macmillan Co., N.Y. : 39) that a majority of members of the *immigrans*-group has been recorded from the Australian and Oriental regions ; and Sturtevant (*op. cit.*) writes that the data suggest that *D. immigrans* may have come from the Pacific region. Also the name *brouni*, 1901, would have date priority over all other species in the group, which *D. immigrans* does not enjoy even when *brouni* is not considered.

8. Until my attention was drawn to the proposed use of the Plenary Powers in this case, I was unaware of Harrison's paper (*op. cit.*), otherwise I would have had no hesitation in coupling the name *brouni* with *immigrans* in my two papers, " Some Drosophilidae of the British Isles " (22.ix.1952, *Ent. mon. Mag.*) and " The Distribution and Biology of Drosophilidae in Scotland " (28.vi.1954, *Trans. Roy. Soc. Edinb.* **62** (3), No. 15).

SUPPORT FOR THE APPLICATION TO VALIDATE THE NAME "IMMIGRANS" STURTEVANT, 1921, AS PUBLISHED IN THE COMBINATION "DROSOPHILA IMMIGRANS"

By ERICH MARTIN HERING
(*Zoologisches Museum der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin*)

(Commission's reference : Z.N.(S.)711)

(Translation of an enclosure to a letter dated 27th September 1954)

I should like to support the application from Mayr, etc. for the placing of the name *Drosophila immigrans* Sturtevant, 1921, on the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* and of the name *D. brouni* Hutton, 1901, on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* on the following grounds :—

(1) The establishment of synonymy between two names of which one is based on a male type and the other on a female type can never claim to be absolutely assured, since a direct comparison of the types from a taxonomic point of view is in such a case not possible.

(2) In cases where synonymy of two names cannot be definitely established for this reason, it is desirable on taxonomic grounds to give preference to the name which is based on the *male* type, since the genital characters make possible in this case an irrefutable determination of the species.

(3) This case is particularly important in the present case of *Drosophila immigrans* Sturtevant, since the original publication of the name was accompanied, not only by a detailed description of the morphology of the Imago, but also by particulars about the first stages and the genetic characteristics.

(4) The applicant has already drawn attention to the quite special conditions to be observed in this particular species in New Zealand. The special biotic factors prevailing in that country change immigrants in quite a small number of years, as Wise (1953, 1954) has shown in the alteration of the ecological balance of *Lithocolletis messaniella* Z. (Lep.).

(5) Since *Drosophila immigrans* Sturtevant, 1921, is a name which has for decades played an important role in genetic publications, in which Hutton's name does not appear at all, it is evident that we have here a case to which the Principle of Conservation announced in the Copenhagen Decisions would have been particularly applicable if only a longer period had elapsed since its publication.

2. For the above reasons I recommend urgently the acceptance of the application by Mayr, etc.

SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSED VALIDATION UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS OF THE SPECIFIC NAME "IMMIGRANS" STURTEVANT, 1921, AS PUBLISHED IN THE COMBINATION "DROSOPHILA IMMIGRANS" (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER DIPTERA)

By F. VAN EMDEN, D.Sc.

(*Commonwealth Institute of Entomology, London*)

(Commission's reference : Z.N.(S).711)

(Letter dated 2nd November 1954)

From my experience with the identification and distribution of the species of the *immigrans* group (= sbg. *Spinulophila*) in the genus *Drosophila* I strongly support the application by Dr. E. Mayr and others for the total suppression of the name *Drosophila brouni* Hutton.

If this cannot be attained I suggest that *brouni* Hutton should be treated as a doubtful synonym of *D. immigrans* Sturt., which seems to be the only way which is both scientifically exact and practical for dealing with this name if retained as valid, since it is impossible to prove at present that *brouni* is identical with *immigrans* but since it is, on the other hand, highly probable that this is the case. The substitution of *brouni* for *immigrans* would therefore be scientifically incorrect and is to be entirely rejected.

SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSED VALIDATION UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS OF THE SPECIFIC NAME "IMMIGRANS" STURTEVANT, 1921, AS PUBLISHED IN THE COMBINATION "DROSOPHILA IMMIGRANS" (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER DIPTERA)

By JOHN SMART, Ph.D., D.Sc.
(*Cambridge University, Department of Zoology, Cambridge*)

(Commision's reference: Z.N.(S)711)

(Letter dated 3rd November 1954)

I have looked up the various papers concerning *Drosophila brouni* and have come to the conclusion that I would wish to support the application of Messrs. Mayr, Paterson, Wheeler, and Spencer. I think that it is very important that we do what we can to prevent confusions of this kind arising and I have already acted in another case [*Drosophila subobscura* Collin, 1936] of this kind (Smart, 1945, *Proc. R. ent. Soc. Lond.*, (B). **14**: 53-6).

OBJECTION TO THE PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO SUPPRESS THE GENERIC NAME "CAENISITES" BUCKMAN (S. S.), 1925 (CLASS CEPHALOPODA, ORDER AMMONOIDEA)

By L. F. SPATH, D.Sc., F.R.S.
(*British Museum (Natural History), London*)

(Commission's reference: Z.N.(S.)798)

(Enclosure to a letter dated 22nd July 1954)

(For the proposal submitted in this case, see *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **6**: 364-366)

1. The proposal by Dr. Arkell and Dr. Donovan that the Plenary Powers be used to suppress the generic name *Caenisites* S. S. Buckman, 1925 (see *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **6** : 364) was made principally on the grounds that the single specimen on which the genus was based is a pathological monstrosity. Objection was made at the same time to the present author's usage of the name *Caenisites* for the group of ammonite species that includes *Ammonites turneri* J. de C. Sowerby (1824 : 75, pl. 452, upper figure). This proposal is opposed on the grounds stated below.

2. While it is true that the unique holotype of the type species of the monotypical nominal genus *Caenisites*, *C. caeneus* Buckman (1925 : pl. DLXXII) is a pathological monstrosity, the abnormality affects only the last half-whorl of the specimen, from 68 to 85 mm. diameter. The remainder of the shell is perfectly normal and shows the characters of the species-group that includes *Amm. turneri* J. de C. Sowerby, *Amm. brooki* J. Sowerby (1818 : 203, pl. 190) and *Amm. plotti* Reynès (1879 : pl. 36, figs. 9-16) among others. The original figures of *C. caeneus* show these characters not only in lateral view but also in ventral view before the beginning of the deformed part of the shell. So long as the species-group in question is regarded as homogeneous, it is not seriously open to question whether *C. caeneus* is a member of it or not.

3. It is a matter of observation that deformed specimens are of common occurrence in this group. One was figured as *Arietites turgescens* by Buckman (1918 : pl. 29, figs. 2a, b) ; another, now considered to be a malformed *Amm. plotti* Reynès, was referred to by me as *Arietites sp.* nov. (1923 : 76). The generic affinities of these and other deformed specimens are not obscured by their malformations.

4. Dr. Donovan (1953 : xiii), in proposing the generic name *Euasteroceras* for *Amm. turneri* J. de C. Sowerby, states that *Caenisites caeneus* does not correspond exactly with *Amm. plotti*, referring to my opinion (1946 : 496) that the former was a malformed specimen of the latter. Whatever the words " correspond exactly " may have been intended to mean (very few individuals of any ammonite species ever correspond *exactly* with each other), he has given no taxonomic reasons to justify the generic separation of *Euasteroceras* from *Caenisites*. He is wrong in stating that degeneration of ornament does not occur in the *turneri*-group. In large examples degeneration similar in type to that known in *Asteroceras* can be seen.

5. On a point of detail, the lectotype of *Amm. turneri* was not, as stated by Dr. Donovan, first designated by Buckman (1898 : 453), but by Oppel (1856 : 82).

6. The intention announced by Dr. Arkell and Dr. Donovan of reproducing the original figures of all type species of all ammonite genera in the forthcoming *Treatise of Invertebrate Paleontology* is quite irrelevant to the nomenclatorial point under discussion. Special pleading of this sort cannot help the Commission to appreciate the essentials of the case. Many genera of ammonites are based on far less satisfactory figures than is *Caenisites*, *Euasteroceras* among them.

7. Many generic names may have been proposed in the mistaken belief that a pathological deformity was a normal morphological character, but most of these cases are so obvious that the subjective element in their interpretation is very small. Moreover, few of such names are involved in situations such as the present where it is generally agreed that a new generic name is needed (for taxonomic purposes) for the species-group to which the pathological specimen belongs. In the writer's opinion, Dr. Arkell and Dr. Donovan are grossly exaggerating the extent of the subjective element in this case. It is claimed that the holotype of *Caenisites caeneus* shows all the characters needed for its generic assignation and that to claim that it is doubtful whether it is a member of the *turneri-plotti* group shows that the authors of the proposal that the generic name *Caenisites* be suppressed have inadequate experience of the many transitional forms in this group.

8. In so far as there is usage of a generic name for the species-group in question, that usage is in favour of maintaining the generic name *Caenisites*. The authors of the proposal to suppress that name have not shown any clear-cut necessity for doing so in the terms of *Opinion* 93. They are, on the other hand, relying on that subjective element in the case which was stressed in the Copenhagen decision to reject Dr. Arkell's application for the inclusion in the *Règles* of a provision invalidating a generic name given to a nominal genus, the type species of which is, in the opinion of later workers, a monstrosity.

9. In the writer's opinion, the nominal genus *Euasteroceras* Donovan, 1953 is a subjective synonym of *Caenisites* Buckman, 1925. It is, therefore, requested that the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature :—

(1) reject the proposal to use their Plenary Powers to suppress the generic name *Caenisites* Buckman, 1925 ;

(2) reject the proposal to use their Plenary Powers to suppress the specific name *caeneus* Buckman, 1925, as published in the binomen *Caenisites caeneus* ;

(3) place the generic name *Caenisites* Buckman, 1925 (type species, by monotypy : *Caenisites caeneus* Buckman) (gender of generic name : masculine) on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* ;

(4) place the specific name *caeneus* Buckman, 1925, as published in the binomen *Caenisites caeneus* on the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* ;

(5) place the generic name *Euasteroceras* Donovan, 1953 (type species, by original designation, *Ammonites turneri* J. de C. Sowerby, 1824) (gender of generic name : neuter) on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology.*

References

Arkell, W. J., and Donovan, D. T., 1954 : *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **6** : 364.
Buckman, S. S., 1898 : *Quart. Journ. geol. Soc. Lond.* **54** : 442-62.
—— 1918 : *ibidem,* **73** : 257-327, pls. xxvi-xxxi.
—— 1925, *Type Ammonites,* **5**, Part LII. London.
Donovan, D. T., 1953 : *Proc. geol. Soc. Lond.*, No. 1503 : xiii-xiv.
Oppel, A., 1856 (-58) : *Die Juraformation.* Stuttgart.
Reynès, P., 1879 : *Monographie des Ammonites.* Paris and Marseille.
Sowerby, J., 1818 : *Mineral Conchology* **2** : 203, pl. 190.
Sowerby, J. de C., 1824 : *Mineral Conchology* **5** : 75, pl. 452.
Spath, L. F., 1923 : *Quart. Journ. geol. Soc. Lond.* **79** : 66-90.
—— 1946 : *Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.* (11) **12** : 490-496.

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED USE OF THE PLENARY POWERS TO SUPPRESS THE GENERIC NAME "CAENISITES" BUCKMAN (S. S.), 1925 (CLASS CEPHALOPODA, ORDER AMMONOIDEA)

By R. V. MELVILLE, M.Sc.
(*Geological Survey and Museum, London*)

(Commission's reference : Z.N.(S.)798)

(Communication received 3rd August 1954)

I have no claim to a specialist knowledge of ammonite-systematics, but from a general acquaintance with the group of ammonites in question, I feel that Dr. Spath's objections to the proposal that *Caenisites* be suppressed, carry more weight than the arguments put forward by Dr. Arkell and Dr. Donovan. I find it difficult to understand how these specialists can, in view of their reputation for scientific objectivity, question whether *Caensites caeneus* belongs to the *turneri* group of ammonite species. The close relationship between *C. caeneus* and this group seems to me as obvious as any point of a taxonomic nature in fossils can be. The malformation of the holotype does not obscure the features which betray this relationship and upon which the generic assignation is based. At the most it might make specific determination difficult in the case of a specimen showing no overlap with the normal portion of the holotype ; though even this difficulty is diminished if Dr. Spath's view (that *C. caeneus* is a malformed variant of *Ammonites plotti* Reynès) is accepted.

I can see no danger to stability and uniformity of nomenclatorial usage in the perpetuation of the generic name *Caenisites*. An analogous case occurs in a group with which I am familiar. The echinoid genus *Hagenowia* Duncan, 1889 (*Journ. Linn. Soc.—Zool.* **23** : 210) has as type species (by monotypy) *Cardiaster rostratus* Forbes, 1852 (*Mem. geol. Surv.*, Decade IV : 1-4, pl. x, figs. 19-24). The holotype of this species is malformed in that the anterior rostrum which is the outstanding generic feature has been shortened by injury during life and has healed without regaining its original length. No difficulty has ever arisen in the interpretation of the genus or of the species, either taxonomically or nomenclatorially as a result of this malformation. The case of *Caenisites* seems to me closely similar and I support Dr. Spath's application for the official recognition of the name.

SUPPORT FOR DR. ARKELL'S PROPOSAL RELATING TO "CAENISITES" BUCKMAN (S. S.), 1925 (CLASS CEPHALOPODA, ORDER AMMONOIDEA)

By HELMUT HOLDER
(*Institut und Museum für Geologie und Paläontologie
der Universität Tübingen, Germany*)

(Commission's reference : Z.N.(S.)798)

(Letter dated 30th September 1954)

Ich schliesse mich dem von W. J. Arkell und D. T. Donovan eingereichten Vorschlag zur Unterdrückung des Gattungs-Namens *Caenisites* Buckman, 1925 an. Denn der Genotypus der Gattung ist auf ein monströses Exemplar (Specie-Typus von *Caenisites caeneus* Buckman) gegründet, das nicht eindeutig bestimmt werden kann. Dieser Sachverhalt widerspricht daher der beabsichtigten Kontinuität der zoologischen Nomenklatur.

SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSED SUPPRESSION UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS OF THE GENERIC NAME "CAENISITES" BUCKMAN (S. S.), 1925 (CLASS CEPHALOPODA, ORDER AMMONOIDEA)

By P. C. SYLVESTER-BRADLEY
(*University of Sheffield, Sheffield, England*)

(Commission's reference: Z.N.(S.)798)

(Communication received 30th September 1954)

I wish to support the recommendation of Arkell and Donovan (1954, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **6** : 364-365) that the Commission should suppress the name *Caenisites* Buckman, 1925. This name was never used since the date of its proposal until its resurrection in 1946, and has not even since then passed into general usage. No confusion can therefore follow its suppression.

The name *Euasteroceras* Donovan, 1953, which by some is considered a subjective synonym of *Caenisites*, is typified by a well-known species characteristic of a group of importance to both Jurassic stratigraphy and palaeontology. Previously these species had been known by the now inadmissible name *Arietites*. Specialists disagree as to the synonymy of *Euasteroceras* and *Caenisites* and agreement can never be reached since the type species of *Caenisites* is known by only the holotype, which all agree to be a monstrosity. The existence of the two names is, therefore, a danger to both stability and universal usage, for stratigraphers who are not ammonite specialists are at a loss which name to use. The suppression of the name *Caenisites* is, therefore, in full accord with the general directive given at Copenhagen for the use of the Commission's Plenary Powers (*Copenhagen Decisions zool. Nomencl.* : 23).

SUPPORT FOR DR. ARKELL'S PROPOSAL RELATING TO "CAENISITES" BUCKMAN (S.S.), 1925 (CLASS CEPHALOPODA, ORDER AMMONOIDEA)

By OTTO H. HAAS
(*The American Museum of Natural History, New York*)

(Commission's reference: Z.N.(S.) 798)

(Letter dated 18th October 1954)

This is to express my full support of the proposal by Drs. Arkell and Donovan, published *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, vol. 6, pt. 12, Feb. 1954, to suppress the generic name *Caenisites* Buckman, 1925.

SUPPORT FOR DR. ARKELL'S PROPOSAL FOR A "DECLARATION" THAT A GENERIC OR SPECIFIC NAME BASED SOLELY UPON THE "APTYCHUS" OF AN AMMONITE BE EXCLUDED FROM AVAILABILITY UNDER THE "RÈGLES"

By C. W. WRIGHT
(*London*)

(Commission's reference : Z.N.(S.)589)

(For Dr. Arkell's application see 1954, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **9** (9) : 266-269)

(Letter dated 30th November 1954)

As a specialist in Mesozoic Ammonoidea I should like to support strongly Dr. Arkell's proposal for a *Declaration* that generic or specific names of ammonite Aptychi should have no validity in zoological nomenclature.

SUPPORT FOR PROFESSOR SWINNERTON'S PROPOSAL TO VALIDATE, UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS, THE SPECIFIC NAME "MINIMUS" MILLER (J.S.), 1826, AS PUBLISHED IN THE COMBINATION "BELEMNITES MINIMUS" (CLASS CEPHALOPODA, ORDER DIBRANCHIA)

By C. W. WRIGHT
(*London*)

(Commission's reference : Z.N.(S.)823)

(For Professor Swinnerton's application see 1954, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **9** (9) : 284-285)

(Letter dated 30th November 1954)

From the points of view both of palaeontology and of Cretaceous stratigraphy I should like to give strong support to Professor Swinnerton's application for the use of the Plenary Powers to validate the specific name *minimus* as published in the combination *Belemnites minimus*.

CONTENTS

(*continued from front wrapper*)

New Applications

Page

Proposed use of the Plenary Powers to validate the generic name *Carinifex* Binney, 1865 (Class Gastropoda). By Joshua L. Baily, Jr. (*San Diego, California, U.S.A.*) 321

Comment on Dr. Joshua L. Baily Jr.s proposal for the validation of the generic name *Carinifex Binney*, 1865 (Class Gastropoda) and an alternative proposal. By Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E. (*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*) 326

Proposed use of the Plenary Powers to validate the family-group name XANTHINAE Dana, 1851 (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda). By Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E. (*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*) 329

Proposed use of the Plenary Powers to validate the generic name *Discias* Rathbun, 1902 (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda). By L. B. Holthuis (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The Netherlands*) 332

Proposed use of the Plenary Powers to validate the generic names *Upogebia* Leach, 1814, and *Processa* Leach, 1815 (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda). By L. B. Holthuis (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The Netherlands*) 334

Proposed validation, under the Plenary Powers, of the family-group names PROCESSIDAE and UPOGEBIINAE (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda). By Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E. (*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*) 340

Comments on previously published applications

Comment on the proposed validation under the Plenary Powers of *immigrans* Sturtevant, 1921, as published in the combination *Drosophila immigrans* (Class Insecta, Order Diptera). By Roy A. Harrison (*Entomologist, Plant Diseases Division, Department of Scientific and Industrial Research, Auckland, New Zealand*) 342

Comment on the proposed validation under the Plenary Powers of *immigrans* Sturtevant, 1921, as published in the combination *Drosophila immigrans* (Class Insecta, Order Diptera). By E. B. Basden (*Institute of Animal Genetics, Edinburgh* 9, *Scotland*) 343

Support for the application to validate the name *immigrans* Sturtevant, 1921, as published in the combination *Drosophila immigrans*. By Erich Martin Hering (*Zoologisches Museum der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin*) 344

Support for the proposed validation under the Plenary Powers of the specific name *immigrans* Sturtevant, 1921, as published in the combination *Drosophila immigrans* (Class Insecta, Order Diptera). By F. van Emden (*Commonwealth Institute of Entomology, London*) .. 345

CONTENTS

(continued from overleaf)

Page

Support for the proposed validation under the Plenary Powers of the specific name *immigrans* Sturtevant, 1921, as published in the combination *Drosophila immigrans* (Class Insecta, Order Diptera). By John Smart, Ph.D., D.Sc. (*Cambridge University, Department of Zoology, Cambridge*) 346

Objection to the proposed use of the Plenary Powers to suppress the generic name *Caenisites* Buckman (S.S.), 1925 (Class Cephalopoda, Order Ammonoidea). By L. F. Spath, D.Sc., F.R.S. (*British Museum (Natural History), London*) 346

Comment on the proposed use of the Plenary Powers to suppress the generic name *Caenisites* Buckman (S.S.), 1925 (Class Cephalopoda, Order Ammonoidea). By R. V. Melville, M.Sc. (*Geological Survey and Museum, London*) 348

Support for Dr. Arkell's proposal relating to *Caenisites* Buckman (S.S.), 1925 (Class Cephalopoda, Order Ammonoidea). By Helmut Hölder (*Institut und Museum fur Geologie und Paläontologie der Universität Tübingen, Germany*) 349

Support for the proposed suppression under the Plenary Powers of the generic name *Caenisites* Buckman (S.S.), 1925 (Class Cephalopoda, Order Ammonoidea). By P. C. Sylvester-Bradley (*University of Sheffield, Sheffield, England*) 349

Support for Dr. Arkell's proposal relating to *Caenisites* Buckman (S.S.), 1925 (Class Cephalopoda, Order Ammonoidea). By Otto H. Haas (*The American Museum of Natural History, New York*) 350

Support for Dr. Arkell's proposal for a *Declaration* that a generic or specific name based solely upon the *Aptychus* of an Ammonite be excluded from availability under the *Règles.* By C. W. Wright (*London*) 350

Support for Professor Swinnerton's proposal to validate, under the Plenary Powers, the specific name *minimus* Miller (J.S.), 1826, as published in the combination *Belemnites minimus* (Class Cephalopoda, Order Dibranchia). By C. W. Wright (*London*) 350

Printed in Great Britain by Metchim & Son Limited, Westminster, London, S.W.1

VOLUME 9. Part 12 13. April ~~31st January~~ 1956
pp. 351—442, i—xxix, T.P.—XXXV

THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

The Official Organ of

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Edited by

FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

CONTENTS :

Notices prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology : Page

Date of commencement by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of voting on applications published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* 351

Notice of the possible use by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of its Plenary Powers in certain cases ... 351

(*continued on back wrapper*)

LONDON :
Printed by Order of the International Trust for
Zoological Nomenclature
and
Sold on behalf of the International Commission on Zoological
Nomenclature by the International Trust at its Publications Office,
41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.
1956

Price Three Pounds, Fifteen Shillings

(*All rights reserved*)

BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Volume 9, Part 12 (pp. 351—442, [i]—xxix, T.P.—XXXV) 31st January 1956

NOTICES PRESCRIBED BY THE INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ZOOLOGY

The following notices are given in pursuance of decisions taken, on the recommendation of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 51—56, 57—59), by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, July 1948 (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **5** : 5—13, 131).

(a) Date of commencement by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of voting on applications published in the "Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature"

Notice is hereby given that normally the International Commission will start to vote upon applications published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* on the expiry of a period of six calendar months from the date of publication in the *Bulletin* of the applications in question. Any specialist who may desire to comment upon the application published in the present Part (Vol. 9, Part 12) of the *Bulletin* is accordingly invited to do so in writing to the Secretary to the Commission, as quickly as possible and in any case, in sufficient time to enable the communication in question to reach the Secretariat of the Commission before the expiry of the six-month period referred to above.

(b) Notice of the possible use by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of its Plenary Powers in certain cases

Notice is hereby given that the possible use by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of its Plenary Powers is involved in

Notices prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology (*continued*)

the following application published in the present Part of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* in relation to the following work :—

> Curtis (J.), 1837, *A Guide to an Arrangement of British Insects* (Ed. 2), suppression of, for the purpose of selection of type species of genera (Z.N.(S.) 298).

2. Comments received in sufficient time will be published in the *Bulletin* : other comments, provided that they are received within the prescribed period of six calendar months from the date of publication of the present Part will be laid before the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at the time of commencement of voting on the application concerned.

3. In accordance with the procedure agreed upon at the Session held by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in Paris in 1948 (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* **4** : 56), corresponding Notices have been sent to the serial publications *Nature* and *Science*.

FRANCIS HEMMING,
Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

28 Park Village East, Regent's Park,
London, N.W.1, England.

31*st January* 1956.

PROPOSED REJECTION FOR THE PURPOSES OF RULE (g) IN ARTICLE 30 OF THE SECOND EDITION OF CURTIS (J.), 1837, "A GUIDE TO AN ARRANGEMENT OF BRITISH INSECTS" OR ALTERNATIVELY THE PROPOSED SUPPRESSION OF THE ABOVE WORK UNDER THE PLENARY POWERS FOR THE FOREGOING PURPOSES

By **C. W. SABROSKY**

(U.S. Department of Agriculture, Agricultural Research Service, Entomology Research Branch, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.)

and

RICHARD E. BLACKWELDER

(United States National Museum, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.)

(Commission's reference : Z.N.(S.) 298)

In 1829 John Curtis published in London a small book entitled *A Guide to an Arrangememt of British Insects*; *being a Catalogue of all the named species hitherto discovered in Great Britain and Ireland.* The book was intended to serve as an exchange list and as an index to Curtis' large *British Entomology.* In 1837 a second edition appeared, revised and enlarged. Perhaps because of their checklist nature, these works have never attracted much attention from entomologists and are infrequently referred to in synonymies and bibliographies.

2. Some time ago it was noticed that the preface to the second edition includes a passage which might be construed to indicate that in it Curtis selected type species for a number of genera. A letter received from a worker in another country shows that others are aware of this action by Curtis. It appears important to examine the case publicly in order to avoid the risk of opposing usages.

3. On pages v and vi of the Preface appears the following statement :—

> It need scarcely be added that the generic and specific names without numbers are considered as synonyms, although many of the former which intersect long genera will most probably be eventually adopted, and it may often happen that all the species following such generic names would not be considered by the author who proposed the name as belonging to his group, but the one immediately following is always a typical species . . .

These " synonyms " occur throughout the work but do not for the most part appear to involve genera of great importance either because of size or nomenclatorial considerations.

4. In spite of the indecisive wording, it is perhaps possible to look upon these first-species placements as definite selections of type species, particularly because Curtis is known to have used the concept of type species in other works and might be presumed to have applied it to this work as well. However, in his other works, his manner of selecting type species is unambiguous and unquestionably acceptable. There is also another difference that seems to be significant. In his *British Entomology* (1824—1840) Curtis selected a type species for each of the seven hundred and seventy genera found in Britain, but the type species so selected is not always a British species and was not always available to Curtis. In the *Guide*, on the other hand, the first species cited is in each case British, and the first species following the generic name is sometimes not the one that Curtis himself had previously selected as the type species. There appears to be good reason to believe, therefore, that Curtis knew and used the type-species concept, but that in the *Guide*, a simple checklist, he meant exactly what he said, namely that the first species " is always a typical species " but that this species was not necessarily the type species of the genus.

5. There are thus two facts which together seem sufficient to refute the claim that type species were selected in the edition of the *Guide* published in 1837. These are :—(1) the indecisive wording, which is different from Curtis' regular practice in his other works, and (2) the difference in treatment between the *Guide* and the *British Entomology*, the latter of which contains unquestionably definite selections of type species.

6. It appears to the writers that Curtis' action in the Second Edition of his *Guide* cannot be considered as amounting to type selections, rigidly construed as provided in Article 30. The expression " *a* typical species " appears to indicate an illustration or example of a genus and not *the* type species of the genus. However, in the event of the Commission taking the view that Curtis' action in this matter ought under a strict application of the *Règles*, to be accepted as amounting to type selections, it is asked to suppress the Second Edition of Curtis' *Guide* under its Plenary Powers for the purposes of Article 30 and, having done so, to place on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Works in Zoological Nomenclature* the title of this work, as suppressed to the extent indicated above.

SUPPORT FOR THE SABROSKY/BLACKWELDER PROPOSAL THAT THE SECOND (1837) EDITION OF CURTIS' " GUIDE TO AN ARRANGEMENT OF BRITISH INSECTS " BE REJECTED FOR THE PURPOSES OF ARTICLE 30

By **FRANCIS HEMMING**, C.M.G., C.B.E.

(*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*)

(Commission's reference : Z.N.(S.) 298)

(For the application submitted in this case see page 353 of the present volume)

(Note dated 23rd August 1955)

Two issues which require separate consideration arise on the application in regard to the status under Article 30 of the Second Edition of Curtis' *Guide to an Arrangement of British Insects* published in 1837 submitted by Dr. Sabrosky and Dr. Blackwelder. These are :—(1) Did Curtis in the above work make type selections for genera within the meaning of Article 30 ? (2) What action on the part of the Commission is required to obviate the risk of these type selections upsetting established usage for the generic names concerned ?

2. On the first of these questions, I should like strongly to support the view expressed by Drs. Sabrosky and Blackwelder that in this work Curtis did no more than what he said he was going to do, namely cite " a typical species " and that it was no part of his intention to select type species for genera in his little *Guide*. When in the early thirties I was preparing my *Generic Names of the Holarctic Butterflies*, I was very much struck by the clear and unequivocal manner in which Curtis selected type species for genera in his *British Entomology*, for in this matter he was far ahead of almost all of his contemporaries. In these circumstances it appears to me to be incredible that, if in the *Guide* of 1837 he had intended to select type species, he should have employed the ambiguous phrase " a typical species " in place of the clear phraseology used by him in his *British Entomology*. It is all the more incredible that at the date in question (1837) he should have acted in this manner, when we recall that at that time his *British Entomology* was still in process of being published, the last instalment not having been published until 1840, three years after the appearance of the Second Edition of the *Guide*.

3. The problem in the present case appears to me to be very similar to that presented by Lamarck's *Systême des Animaux sans Vertèbres* of 1801, for in that work Lamarck cited for each genus a typical species without clearly stating that that species was regarded by him as the type species of that genus, just as in his *Guide* of 1837 Curtis cited " a typical species " without stating that he was selecting that species to be the type species. In the case of Lamarck's *Systême* the Commission in its *Opinion* 79 (1924, *Smithson. misc. Coll.* 73 (No. 2) : 15—16) gave a Ruling that the above work by Lamarck " is not to be accepted as designation of type species ". This is the course which, in effect, Drs. Sabrosky and Blackwelder recommend should be adopted in the present case, a recommendation which I strongly support. If on the other hand the view were to be taken that despite the similarities noted above, the *Guide* should be regarded as differing in this respect from the *Systême*, I would strongly support the alternative proposal submitted by the above specialists, namely that the Plenary Powers should be used to disqualify the *Guide* of 1837 for the purposes of Article 30, for, as was clearly stressed in the discussions on the need for promoting stability in zoological nomenclature held at Copenhagen in 1953, changes in the type species of genera resulting from the discovery of long-overlooked type selections are just as objectionable as the sinking of well-known names as synonyms of long-overlooked names of older date. Indeed, in some respects changes of the first of these classes are even more

objectionable than those of the second class, for the element of confusion is greater when an established name has to be used in a new and unaccustomed sense than when an established and familiar name is sunk in synonymy.

4. In order to provide for the possibility that the view might be taken that in the *Guide* of 1837 Curtis did select type species for genera, the applicants in the present case, on my suggestion, inserted in their proposal a request that, if the foregoing view were to be taken, the Commission should use its Plenary Powers to prevent established type selections from being disturbed on this account. By this means the Plenary Powers machinery has been set in motion and will be available in the event of its use being considered necessary to secure the end desired.

5. There are thus two alternatives now laid before the Commission for consideration in this case. These are as follows :—

Alternative " A "

Under this Alternative the Commission would :—

(1) give a Ruling that in the Second Edition of the work entitled *A Guide to an Arrangement of British Insects* published in 1837 Curtis (J.) did not select type species for the genera there enumerated ;

(2) place the title of the above work on the *Official List of Works Approved as Available for Zoological Nomenclature*, with an endorsement in the terms of (1) above.

Alternative " B "

Under this Alternative the Commission would :—

(1) use its Plenary Powers to suppress for the purposes of Rule (g) in Article 30 all entries in the Second Edition of the work by Curtis (J.) published in 1837 under the title *A Guide to an Arrangement of British Insects* ;

(2) place the title of the foregoing work :—

  (a) on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Works in Zoological Nomenclature* with an endorsement as in (1) above ;

  (b) on the *Official List of Works Approved as Available for Zoological Nomenclature*, with an endorsement excepting from the above entry the portion suppressed under the Plenary Powers under (1) above.

For the reasons explained in their application Drs. Sabrosky and Blackwelder favour Alternative " A " and I fully share their view.

CORRIGENDA

page 19. Paragraph 16, line 17 : substitute " given genus " for " given species ".

page 51. Point (1) (b) (iii) : substitute "*novae-hollandiae* " for " *novaehollandiae* ".

pages 53–60. Insert square brackets round the name " Tunstall " and also round the page reference wherever the name " *Pyrrhocorax* " Tunstall is cited.

page 54. Last line of title : substitute " **CONGRESS** " for " **NOMENCLATURE** ".

page 60. Line 9 : substitute " **13** : 385 " for " 13 : 385 ".

page 66. First line : substitute " 1819 " for " 1815 ".

page 66. Paragraph 2, Point (2), line 2 : substitute "*Fringilla* " for "*Fringillo* ".

page 66. Paragraph 2, Point (2), line 3 : substitute "*Nat.*" for " Nat." and " : 921 " for " : 96 ".

page 71. Paragraph 3, Point (2), line 2 : substitute " tautonymous " for " cautonymous ".

page 73. Line 10 : substitute " Linnaeus " for " Linneaus ".

page 80. First paragraph, line 2 : substitute "*Official List* " for " *Official Lsit* ".

page 82. Paragraph 7, line 6 : substitute " macroura " for " macoura ".

page 86. Line 2 : substitute "*Balaeniceps* Gould " for "*Balaeniceps* Rex ".

page 92. Point (3) (b) : substitute " Nevroptères " for " Nevropteres ".

page 92. Point (3) (c), line 1 : substitute " 1758 " for " 1858 ".

page 92. Point (3) (c), line 2 : substitute " 1752 " for " 1758 ".

page 93. Paragraph 2, line 2 : substitute "*gallinago* " for "*gallinaga* ".

page 98. Paragraph 2, line 7 : substitute " 1789 " for " 1788 " and insert "(2)" before the colon.

page 100. Point (1) (b), line 4 and Point (2), line 3 : substitute " 1789 " for " 1788 ".

pages 102 and 103 : substitute " Buturlin " for " Buterlin " wherever this name occurs.

page 103. Paragraph 4, Point (2), lines 3 and 7 : substitute " *yamashina* " for " *yamashima* ".

page 105. Point (2) (b), line 1, insert square brackets round " 1776 ".

page 106. Third line from end : substitute "*ferruginea* " for " *ferrugineas* ".

page 116. Line 3 : substitute "*Index* " for "*List* ".

page 122. Last line but five substitute " [1833] " for " 1838 ".

page 127. Point (2) (c), line 1 : insert square brackets round date " 1833 ".

page 134. Address of author: substitute "*Colorado*" for "*Colarodo*".

page 163. Paragraph 3, line 3 : substitute " : 296 " for " : 317 ".

page 165. Last line but one : insert square brackets round date " 1854 ".

page 183. Point (3), line 3 : delete "*Trivial*".

page 204. Appendix 2, second line of title : substitute " **Naturgeschichte** " for " **Naturegeschichte** ".

page 210. Line 17 from bottom : insert " de " between " Geoffroy " and " Saint Hilaire ".

page 214. Line 13 : substitute " **3**, pt. 2 " for " **30**, 2 ".

page 216 and 217. Substitute "*muelleri*" for "*mülleri*" wherever this name occurs.

page 218. Point (3) (a), line 1 : substitute " three " for " four ".

page 222. Point (4) line 1 : substitute "*Index*" for " *List* ".

page 246. Point (4) line 1 : substitute " Invalid Original Spelling " for " incorrect spelling ".

page 254. Seventh line from bottom : substitute " Taschenbuch Min." for " Min. Taschenbuch ".

page 269. Title of second Note, line 2 : substitute " **GEOFFROY** " for " **GEOFEFRY** ".

page 269. Second and third lines from bottom of page : substitute " Geoffroy " for " Geoffrey ".

page 286. Title, line 2 of both Notes : substitute "AMPHIBIA" for " REPTILIA" (similar correction of back cover).

page 297. Point (4) (b), line 5 : insert "*Dama*" before " Gray ".

page 304. Paragraph 2 (2), line 3 : substitute " : 28 " for " **28** ".

page 307. Paragraph 10, line 5 : substitute "*Helicella*" for "*Helcella*".

pages 325 and 327. In each case last line but one : after " Lea " substitute " 1864 " for " 1858 ".

page 326. Point (4), line 1: substitute "*Index*" for "*List*".

page 340. Sixth line from bottom and page 341, Paragraph 3, line 4 : substitute " Borradaile " for " Borrodaile ".

page 341. Paragraph 3, line 5 : substitute " synonym " for " synomym ".

Special Note : Gmelin (J. F.), 1788–1792, 13th edition of Linnaeus *Systema Naturae*, tom. 1 (pars. 1–7) : the dates of names in parts 2–7, commencing with page 501 (1789–1792) should be quoted in square brackets wherever they occur in the present volume and accordingly they are so cited in the Subject Index.

INDEX
TO AUTHORS OF APPLICATIONS AND OF COMMENTS ON APPLICATIONS

Page

Aczél, M. 238

d'Aguilar, J. 238

Alexander, C. P. 234

Alvarez, J. 273

Amadon, D. .. 45-46, 48-49

d'Andretta, M. A. V. 235

Andrews, H. W... 235

Anduze, P. J. 235

Arkell, W. J. 266-269

Arnaud, P. H., Jr. 234

Bailey, R. M. 272-274

Baily, J. L., Jr. .. 321-326

Baisas, F. E. 237

Balfour-Browne, Jr. .. 128-130

Balss, H... 121

Barbosa, F. A. S. 238

Barendrecht, G... .. 238, 239

Barnes, H. F. 235

Barretto, M. P. 235

Basden, E. B. 343-344

Page

Beckman, W. C. 273

Beebe, W. 273

Beignan, H. G. .. 66-67

Belkin, J. N. 234, 239

Bell, E. L. 136

Bellamy, R. E. 234

Benoit, P. L. G. 236

Benson, R. B. 318

Bequaert, J. 234

Bequaert, M. 236

Berlioz, J. 6-7, 52, 54, 62

Beuret, H. 135

Blackwelder, R. E. .. 353-354

Blake, E. R. 66-67

Blanton, F. S. 234

Bohart, G. E. 234, 239

Bohart, R. M. 234

Bonham, K. 273

Breder, C. M., Jr. 273

Breland, O. P. 234

Page
Brittan, M. R. 273

Brookman, B. 234, 239

Brooks, A. R. 234, 239

Brown, C. J. D. 273

Brown, F. M. 134, 139

Brues, C. T. 234

Brundin, L. 236

Bryk, F. 132

Buxton, P. A. 236

Cabrera, A. .. 206-207, 299-300

Camras, S. 234

Carlander, K. D. 273

Carrera, M. 235

Casey, R. .. 250-254, 278-280

Chace, F. A. 127

Chapman, W. M. 273

Christophers, Sir R. 236

Clements, A. N. 236

Coe, R. L. 236

Coher, E. I. 234

Cole, F. R. 234

Collart, A. 236, 239

Page
Collin, J. E., ... 236

Cooper, G. P. 273

Correa, R. R. 235

Cortés, P. R. 235

Cox, L. R. 265

Cross, F. R. 273

Curran, C. H. 234

Dalmat, H. T. 234

Davies, D. Dwight 299

Davies, D. M. 234

Day, C. D. 236

de Buen, F. 273

Delacour, J. 45-46

del Campo, M. 273

De Meillon, B. 237

Dendy, J. S. 273

Diakonoff, A. 151

Dodge, H. R. 234

Doesburg, P. H. van, Sr. .. 238

Dollfus, R. Ph. 144

Dos Passos, C. F. .. 153-154, 281-283

Page

Downes, J. A. 236

Dupuis, C. 238, 239

Dymond, J. R. 273

Efflatoun, H. C... .. 237, 239

Ellis, A. E. 304-308

Emden, F. I. van. 236

Emlen, J. J., Jr. .. 66-67

Enders, R. K. 300

Engel, H. 158

Esaki, T... 237

Eschmeyer, R. W. 273

Everhart, W. H. 273

Fairchild, G. B... 234

Fernandez-Yepez, A. 273

Fernandez-Yepez, F. 235

Ferris, G. F. 234

Fluke, C. L. 234, 239

Follett, W. I. .. 274, 274-275

Fonseca, E. C. M. d'Assis- .. 236

Fonseca, J. Pinto da 235

Foote, R. H. 241-246

Page

Forattini, O. P. 235

Forbes, W. T. M. .. 133, 149

Forcart, L. 301-303

Freeborn, S. B. 234

Franclemont, J. G. 144, 145, 149-150, 154, 155

Franz, E. 136

Freeman, H. W. 274

Freeman, P. 236

Freeman, T. N. 138

Frey, D. G. 274

Frey, R. 236

Frick, K. E. 234

Galvao, A. L. 235

Gherking, S. D. 274

Ghesquière, J. 236

Glavert, L. 45-46

Gloyd, H. K. 155

Gomes, A. L. 273

Gordon, K. 121

Gordon, M. 273

Gosline, W. A. 273

Page

Greeley, J. R. 273

Greene, C. W. 273

Grensted, L. W. 236

Grey, L. P. 140

Grey, M. 273

Gunter, G. 273

Haas, O. H. 350

Hachisuka, Marquess .. 102-103

Hall, D. G. 234, 239

Hardy, D. E. 238, 239

Hardy, G. H. 237

Harrington, R. W., Jr. .. 273

Harrison, R. A. .. 237, 342-343

Heinz, H. J. 237

Hemming, F.
8-29, 47-49, 54-61, 63-64, 68-69, 70-75, 80-84, 85-86, 86-88, 89-92, 93-95, 113-117, 119-120, 135, 152, 184-187, 188-190, 193-201, 214-218, 219-220, 263, 264, 276-277, 281-283, 293-297, 309-312, 326-328, 329-331, 340-341, 355-356.

Hennig, W. 238

Herald, E. S. 273

Page

Hering, E. M. .. 285, 344-345

Hesse, A. J. 237

Hobby, B. M. 236

Holder, H. 349

Holthuis, L. B.
114-115, 118, 121, 122-127, 270-271, 332-333, 334-340

Hopkins, G. H. E. 236

Hottes, F. C.
163-165, 166-173, 174-183

Hubbs, Carl L. .. 274, 274-275

Hubbs, Clark 273

Hull, F. M. 234

Inger, R. F. 273

International Council for the Exploration of the Sea, Shellfish Sub-Committee of the
145-146

Jacob, F. H. 186

James, M. T. .. 234, 239, 269

Jobling, B. 236

Johannsen, O. A. .. 234, 239

Johnson, R. E. 273

Jordan, K. 204-206

Page
Kato, S. 237
Keen, A. M. .. 130, 257-262
Keiser, F. 236
Kessel, E. L. 238, 239
Kettle, D. S. 236
King, W. V. 234, 239
Kirby, H. 208-214
Klauber, L. M. 158
Knapp, F. T. 274
Komp, W. H. W. 234
Koster, W. J. 273
Kröber, O. 236, 239
Kruseman, G., Jr. 236

Lachner, E. Q. 273
Laffoon, J. L. 234
Lagler, K. F. 273
La Monte, F. R. 273
Lane, John 235
Laurence, B. R. 236
Laven, H. 238
Lee, D. J. 237
Legendre, V. 273

Page
Lempke, B. J. 131
Lengersdorf, F. 236, 239
Lever, R. J. A. W. 237
Lima, A. da C. 235
Lower, H. F. 237
Lucker, J. M. 143
Lumsden, W. H. 238

McAlpine, J. F. 238
McIntosh, A. 141-142
McLane, W. M. 273
Machado, A. de B. 237
Mackerras, I. M. 237
Malloch, J. R. 234
Mannheims, B. 238
Mansueti, R. 273
Manter, H. W. 143
Marcuzzi, G. 238
Marks, E. N. 237
Marr, J. C. 273
Marshall, N. 273
Martin, C. H. 234
Martinez Palacios, A. 235

Page

Martini, E. 236

Mather, B. 138

Matheson, R. 234

Mayer, K. 238, 239

Mayr, E. .. 45-46, 48, 137, 161-162

Meinertzhagen, R.
6-7, 30-31, 32-37, 38-39, 40-43, 50-51, 52, 53, 62, 65-67, 76, 91, 94-95, 96-97, 101

Melville, R. V. .. 348-349

Menon, M. A. U. 237

Mertens, R. 286

Mesnil, L. P. 236, 239

Middlekauff, W. W. 234

Miller, A. H. 66-67

Miller, R. R. 272-274

Moore, G. A. 273

Morrison, J. P. E. 144

Morrison-Scott, T. C. S. 207, 298

Muller, S. W. 130

Munro, H. K. 237

Munroe, E. .. 136, 139-140

Murphy, R. C. 45-46

Muspratt, J. 237

Page

Myers, G. S. 273

Nayar, K. K. 237, 239

Niblett, M. 236, 239

Nichols, J. T. 273

Nicholson, H. P. 234

Nielsen, P. 236, 239

Nixon, G. E. J. 318

Norris, K. R. 237

Okada, T. 238, 239

Oldroyd, H. 236, 239

Oliver, J. A. 157

Osgood, W. H. 202-203

Paclt, J. .. 131, 147-148, 221-222

Painter, R. H. 234

Palmer, K. V. W. .. 219, 269

Palmer, M. A. 186

Paramonov, S. J. 237

Parmenter, L. 236

Parr, A. E. 273

Parrot, L. 237

Paterson, H. A. 237

Page
Patterson, B. 299
Patterson, J. T. 161-162, 234
Pechuman, L. L. .. 238, 239
Peris, S. V. 236
Perkins, C. B. 156
Perkins, J. F. 318
Peters, J. L. 77-79, 82
Peus, F. 238
Philip, C. B. 244, 239
Pitelka, F. A. 66-67
Pope, C. H. 158
Pritchard, A. E. .. 234, 239

Quate, L. M. 234

Rand, A. L. 66-67
Raney, E. C. 273
Rapp, W. F. 234
Reid, J. A. 237
Reinhard, H. J. 234
Remington, C. L. .. 238, 239
Richards, O. W. .. 236, 318
Ricker, W. E. 274

Page
Riley, N. D. 222, 283
Rindge, F. H. 151
Rivas, L. R. 274
Roback, S. S. 235, 239
Rogers, C. H. 66-67
Rogers, J. S. 235
Rozeboom, L. E. 235

Sabrosky, C. W.
225-240, 241-246, 286, 353-354
Sàcca, G. 236
Sachtleben, H. 238
Salmon, J. T. 237
Sanborn, C. C. 299
Sara, M. M. 236
Satchell, G. H. 237
Saunders, L. G. 235
Schlinger, E. I. 235
Schmidt, K. P. 137, 140, 158, 299
Schmitz, H. 236
Schultz, L. P. 274
Scott, D. C. 274
Scott, W. B. 274

Page

Séguy, E. 238

Senior-White, R. A. 235

Serventy, D. L. 45-46, 48

Shaw, F. R. 235

Shewell, G. E. 238, 239

Shiraki, T. 238, 239

Sigler, W. F. 274

Simon, J. R. 274

Smart, J. 236, 346

Smith, Hobart M. 157, 247-249

Snyder, F. M. 235, 239

Soot-Ryen 239

Spath, L. F. 346-348

Spencer, G. J. 235

Spencer, W. P. 161-162

Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature of the International Ornithological Congress
6-7, 30-31, 32-37, 38-39, 40-43, 50-51, 52, 53, 62, 65-67, 101

Steyskal, G. C. 235, 239

Stone, A. .. 238, 239, 241-246

Strenzke, K. 236

Page

Stresemann, E.
6-7, 30-31, 32-37, 38-39, 40-43, 52, 53, 62, 67

Strickland, E. H. 235

Stuardo, C. 235

Sturtevant, A. H. 235

Sinnerton, H. H. 284

Sylvester-Bradley, P. C. .. 349

Taylor, E. H. 156

Taylor, W. R. 274

Tee-Van, J. 274

Test, A. R. 130

Theowald, B. 238

Thienemann, A. 236

Thomas, H. T. 236

Thompson, W. R. 235

Tjeder, B. 236

Townes, H. K. 238, 239

Trautman, M. B. 274

Traylor, M. A. 66-67

Tuomikoski, R. K. 236

Tuxen, S. L. 236

Tweedie, M.F.W. 121

Page
Vaillant, F. 237, 239
Van Emden, F. 345
Vanschuytbroeck, P. .. 237, 239
Vargas, L. 235
Vaurie, C. .. 104-105, 105-106
Venturi, F. 237
Verbeke, J. 237
Vladykov, V. D. 274
Vockeroth, J. R. 238

Warren, B. C. S. 132
Weems, H. V., Jr. 235
Weisel, G. F. 274
Wenzel, R. L. 235
West, L. S. 235
Weyer, F. 237
Wheeler, M. P. .. 161-162, 235

Page
Whittell, H. M. .. 44, 45-46
Wilimovsky, N. J. 274
Winckworth, R. .. 304-308
Wirth, W. W. .. 238, 241-246
Wolfson, A. 66-67
Womersley, H. 237
Woods, L. P. 274
Wright, C. W. .. 278-280, 350
Wygodzinsky, P. 235

Yarrow, I. H. H. .. 313-317

Zangerl, R. 299
Zimmer, J. T.
6-7, 30-31, 32-37, 38-39, 40-43, 52, 53, 62, 67, 98-100
Zimmerman, E. C. 235
Zumpt, F. 237, 239

SUBJECT INDEX

Page

Achatinigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Acmea-Acmaea-Acme-Truncatella complex (Class Gastropoda), support for recommendations on 130

adippe Denis & Schiffermüller, 1775, as published in the combination *Papilio adippe* (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera), comments regarding proposed validation of 131, 132, 135, 136, 137

Agapetes Billberg, 1820, proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy 221–222

support for the above proposal 222

proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 222

Aglaja Renier, [1807] (Phylum Mollusca), question whether validation of, under the Plenary Powers desirable 257–262, 264

advertisement of the above contingency 256

proposed addition of, if not so validated, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262, 264

comment on the proposed suppression of 265

alba Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Motacilla alba* (Class Aves), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 70–74

albicollis Gmelin (J. F.), [1789], as published in the combination *Fringilla albicollis* (Class Aves), proposed validation of, under the Plenary Powers, to be the name of the White-throated Sparrow, and addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 65–67

albiventer Lesson, 1831, as published in the combination *Carbo albiventer*, proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* ... 41

Page

Alcyonaria Renier, [1807], (Phylum Mollusca), question whether validation of, under the Plenary Powers desirable 257–262, 264

advertisement of the above contingency 256

proposed addition of, if not so validated, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology*... ... ... 262, 264

americ. [sic] Linnaeus, 1776, as published in the combination *Vermivora americ.*, proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers, for the purposes both of the Law of Priority and of the Law of Homonymy ... 65–67

advertisement of the above proposal 3

proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology*... 65

comment on the above proposals 68–69

Amphibulimigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Ampullarigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Anatifigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Anatinigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Ancilla Lamarck, 1799 (Class Gastropoda), request for a ruling on type species of 219

proposed acceptance of *Ancilla cinnamomea* Lamarck, 1801, as type species of 219–220

proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* ... 220

comment on the above proposal 269

Ancilligenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Anisocaris Ortmann, 1893, proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy 332

Page

proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 333

Ankundung eines Systematischen Werkes von den Schmetterlingen der Wiener Gegend, 1775, comment on authorship to be attributed to... 135

Anodontigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

anomalus Herbst, 1804, as published in the combination *Cancer* (*Astacus*) *anomalus* (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 339

Anomigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

apiaster Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Merops apiaster* (Class Aves), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 70–74

aptychi of ammonites, proposed suppression under the Plenary Powers of certain names given to 268

Aptychus Meyer, 1831, proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers 266–268

advertisement of the above proposal 256

support for the above proposal 350

proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 268

Aptycus Deshayes, 1845, proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers 266–268

advertisement of the above proposal 256

proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 268

araracina Linnaeus, 1776, as published in the combination *Psittacus araracina*, question of addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* 68, 69

Archigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Arenarigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Page

Arge Hübner, [1819], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology*... ... ... 221, 222

Argus Bohadsch, 1761 (Class Gastropoda), proposed retention of status of for the purposes of the Law of Homonymy... 281–283

advertisement of the above proposal... 256

proposed addition of, as suppressed for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology*... 283

Argus Scopoli, 1763 (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera), proposed rejection of, as a junior homonym of *Argus* Bohadsch, 1761... ... ... 281, 282

support for the above proposal 283

armillatus Renier, [1807], as published in the combination *Rodens armillatus*, proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* 262

Aspergilligenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Aspidoceras Zittel, 1868 (Class Cephalopoda, Order Ammonoidea), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, with *Ammonites rogoznikensis* Zeuchner, 1868, as type species... 268

gender of name 268

Astacus, any available use of, as a generic name prior to *Astacus* Fabricius, 1775 (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda), proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers, for the purposes both of the Law of Priority and of the Law of Homonymy... 113–117

proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 117

astacus Linnaeus, 1758, *Cancer* (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda), proposed designation of, under the Plenary Powers, to be the type species of *Astacus* Fabricius, 1775... 114–117

proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* ... 117

Page

Astacus Pallas, 1772 (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda), proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers, for the purposes both of the Law of Priority and of the Law of Homonymy... 113–117

proposed removal of, from the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* and proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 117

comment on the above proposals 118

Astacus Fabricius, 1775 (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda), proposed substitution of, on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, for *Astacus* Pallas, 1772, with *Cancer astacus* Linnaeus, 1758, as type species ... 114–117

gender of name 117

advertisement of the above proposal 109

Astacus Erichson, 1847, proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology*... 117

atherinoides Rafinesque, 1818, as published in the combination *Notropis atherinoides* (Class Osteichthyes), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 272

atra Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Fulica atra* (Class Aves), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 70–74

atrox Baird & Girard 1853, as published in the combination *Crotalus atrox* (Class Reptilia, Order Squamata), support for proposed validation of 155,156

Auriculigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

australis Gmelin (J. F.), [1789], as published in the combination *Sterna australis*, proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy 40, 41

advertisement of the above proposal... 3

proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* 41

Balaeniceps Gould (Class Aves), proposed correction of date of publication of, to 1850, and reference for, in the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* 85, 86

Page

Balanigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

barbata Gmelin (J. F.), 1788, *Muscicapa* (Class Aves), proposed designation of, under the Plenary Powers, to be the type species of *Myiobius* Darwin, 1839 98–100

proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* ... 100

barrowi Gray (J. E.), 1829, as published in the combination *Otis barrowi* (Class Aves), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 33

Bibio Geoffroy, 1762 (Class Insecta, Order Diptera), proposed validation of, under the Plenary Powers 241–245

advertisement of the above proposal 224

support for the above proposal 269

gender of name 246

proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, with *Tipula hortulana* Linnaeus, 1758, as type species... 246

bicator, Linnaeus, 1776, as published in the combination *Coracias bicator*, question of addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* 68–69

bilineatus Renier, [1804], as published in the combination *Cerebratulus bilineatus*, proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* 262

Binney (W. G.), 1863, *Synopsis of the species of Air-Breathing Mollusks of North America*, proposed addition of title of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Works in Zoological Nomenclature* 327

Bodenheimer, F. S., see Commission, International, on Zoological Nomenclature, Membership of

Bohadsch (J. B.), 1761, *De Quibusdam Animalium marinis*, see *Opinion* 185

Bombyx Fabricius, 1775 (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera), comment regarding proposed acceptance of 154

Page

borealis Gmelin (J. R.), [1789], as published in the combination *Motacilla* ***borealis***, proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy 40–41

advertisement of the above proposal... 3

proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* 41

brachydactila Leisler, 1814, as published in the combination *Alauda brachydactila*, proposed emendation of, to *brachydactyla* (Class Aves) 52

brachydactyla, proposed emendation to, of *brachydactila* Leisler, 1814, as published in the combination *Alauda brachydactila* (Class Aves)... ... 52

proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* ... 52

Bradley, J. Chester, see Commission, International, on Zoological Nomenclature, Presidency of

brouni Hutton, 1901, as published in the combination *Drosophila brouni*, proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy... 161–162

proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* 162

Bubo Brisson, 1760, proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers, for the purposes both of the Law of Priority and of the Law of Homonymy 89–91

proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 92

Bubo Duméril, 1806 (Class Aves), proposed validation of, under the Plenary Powers and confirmation of position of, on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*... 89–92

advertisement of the above proposal 3

Bubo Rambur, 1842, proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology*... 92

Buccinigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Bulimigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Page

Bulligenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Burhinus Illiger, 1811 (Class Aves), proposed confirmation of position of, on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*... 88

caeneus Buckman, 1925, as published in the combination *Caenisites caeneus* (Class Cephalopoda, Order Ammonoidea), objection to the proposed suppression of 346–347

proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* ... 348

Caenisites Buckman (S. S.), 1925, (Class Cephalopoda, Order Ammonoidea), support for the proposed suppression of 349, 350

proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, with *Caenisites caeneus* Buckman, 1925, as type species 347

objections to the proposed suppression of 346–347, 348–349

cafer Lichtenstein, 1793, as published in the combination *Cuculus cafer*, proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy ... 32–33, 34–37

advertisement of the above proposal 3

proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* 33

cafra Lichtenstein, 1793, as published in the combination *Otis cafra*, proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy 32–33, 34–37

advertisement of the above proposal 3

proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* 33

Calceoligenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

calcitrans Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Conops calcitrans* (Class Insecta, Order Diptera), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 246

Page

calidris Linnaeus, 1776, as published in the combination *Motacitta* [sic] *calidris*, question of addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* 68–69

Callianassa Leach, 1814 (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* ... 337–338

CALLIANASSIDAE Dana, 1852 (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology*, with *Callianassa* Leach, 1814, as type genus 339

Calman, William Thomas, see Commission, International, on Zoological Nomenclature, Membership of

Calypso Risso, 1816, an objective junior synonym of *Melia* Bosc, 1813, proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology*... 339

Calyptraeigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Cambaroides Faxon, 1884 (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, with *Astacus japonicus* de Haan, 1841, as type species 117

gender of name 117

camelus Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Struthio camelus* (Class Aves), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 96–97

Camponotus Mayr, 1861 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, with *Formica ligniperda* Latreille, 1802, as type species 312

gender of name 312

canaliculata Leach, 1815, as published in the combination *Processa canaliculata* (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 339

Cancellarigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

candidus Renier, [1807], as published in the combination *Solecurtus candidus*, proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* 262

Page

canorus Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Cuculus canorus* (Class Aves), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 70–74

Capella Frenzel, 1801 (Class Aves), proposed validation of, under the Plenary Powers, with *Capella coelestis* Frenzel, 1801, as type species... 93–95

advertisement of the above proposal 3

proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* ... 95

Capella Keyserling & Blasius, 1840, proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 95

Caprimulgus Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Aves), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, with *Caprimulgus europaeus* Linnaeus, 1758, as type species... 70–73

gender of name 73

Capsigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Cardigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Carditigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Carinifex Binney, 1863, proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers, for the purpose of the Law of Priority 321–325

proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 326, 328

Carinifex Binney, 1865 (Class Gastropoda), proposed validation of, under the Plenary Powers 321–326

advertisement of the above proposal 320

gender of name 326, 328

comment on the above proposal 326–328

proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, with *Planorbis newberryi* Lea, 1858, as type species 326, 328

Page

Carnifex Keep, 1893, an Invalid Subsequent Spelling of *Carinifex* Binney, 1865, proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 326, 328

carolinensis Linnaeus, 1766, as published in the combination *Columba carolinensis* (Class Aves), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 84

cartusiana Müller (O. F.), 1774, as published in the combination *Helix cartusiana* (Class Gastropoda), specific name of the type species of *Monacha* Fitzinger, 1833, proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 308

caspicus Hablizl, 1783, as published in the combination *Colymbus caspicus*, proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy... ... 30–31

advertisement of the above proposal 3

proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* 30

Cassigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

cellaria Müller (O. F.), 1774, as published in the combination *Helix cellaria* (Class Gastropoda), specific name of type species of *Oxychilus* Fitzinger, 1833, proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 308

Cerebratulus Renier, [1804], (Phylum Mollusca), question whether validation of, under the Plenary Powers desirable 257–262, 263

advertisement of the above contingency 256

proposed addition of, if not so validated, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Cerithiigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Certhia Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Aves), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, with *Certhia familiaris* Linnaeus, 1758, as type species 70–73

gender of name 73

Page

cerulea Bennett (F. D.), 1840, as published in the combination *Sterna cerulea* (Class Aves), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 41

chamaeleon Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Musca chamaeleon* (Class Insecta, Order Diptera), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 246

Chamigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Cheloniceras Hyatt, 1903 (Class Cephalopoda, Order Ammonoidea), proposed setting aside, under the Plenary Powers, of all previous type selections for, and designation of *Ammonites cornuelianus* d'Orbigny, 1841, to be the type species of 278–280

advertisement of the above proposal 256

proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* ... 280

gender of name 280

Chitonigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

chlorotis Forster, 1794, as published in the combination *Muscicapa chlorotis*, proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy... 45–46, 50–51

advertisement of the above proposal 3

proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* 51

chrysops Latham, 1801, as published in the combination *Sylvia chrysops* (Class Aves), proposed validation of 47–49

proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* ... 51

Cinara Curtis, 1835 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera), proposed setting aside, under the Plenary Powers, of all previous type selections for, and designation of *Aphis pini* Linnaeus, 1758, as type species... 179–183

advertisement of the above proposal 160

proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* ... 183

report on the above proposal 184–187

Page

Cinaria Baker, 1920, proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology*... 183

cinereus Linnaeus, 1776, as published in the combination *Todos* [sic] *cinereus*, question of addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* 68–69

cinnamomea Lamarck, 1801, as published in the combination *Ancilla cinnamomea* (Class Gastropoda), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 220

cirrhatus Gmelin (J. F.), [1789], as published in the combination *Pelecanus cirrhatus*, proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy 40–41

advertisement of the above proposal 3

proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* 41

clamosus Latham, 1801, as published in the combination *Cuculus clamosus* (Class Aves), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 33

Clavatuligenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

coelebs Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Fringilla coelebs* (Class Aves), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 70–74

colchicus Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Phasianus colchicus* (Class Aves), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 70–74

Columbelligenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Colymbus Linnaeus, 1758, report on, prepared by Secretary at the request of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 1948 15–29

proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy ... 6–7, 8–14

advertisement of the above proposal... 3

proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 7, 14

Page

Colymbus Paetel, 1875, proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 14

Colymbus Hadding, 1913, proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 14

Commission, International, on Zoological Nomenclature

(a) Membership of :—

(i) *Presidency of*

Bradley, J. Chester (*U.S.A.*), elected to... 107

(ii) *Death reported*

Calman, William Thomas (*United Kingdom*) 108

(iii) *Obituary Notice for*

Peters, President James Lee (*U.S.A.*) 111

(iv) *Retirement*

Pearson, Joseph (*Australia*) 289

(v) *Election of new Commissioners*

Bodenheimer, F. S. (*Israel*) 290
Key, K. H. L. (*Australia*)... 289
Kühnelt, Wilhelm (*Austria*) 290
Mayr, Ernst (*U.S.A.*) 290
Miller, Alden H. (*U.S.A.*) 289
Prantl, Ferdinand (*Czechoslovakia*) 289

(b) Co-operation by, with specialist bodies concerned with zoological nomenclature

Polish Academy of Science, appointment by, of a group of specialists 291

Tenth International Ornithological Congress, Uppsala, 1950, appointment by, of a Standing Committee on Ornithological Nomenclature 4

Concolepadigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Conigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Coracia Brisson, 1760, proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy 53, 54–61

proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 60

Page

Coracia Hübner, [1819], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology*... 61

Coracia Moerch, 1865, proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology*... 61

Coracias Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Aves), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* with *Coracias garrulus* Linnaeus, 1758, as type species 60

Coracias Herrmannsen, 1847, proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 61

corax Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Corvus corax* (Class Aves), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 70–74

Corbuligenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

coridon Poda, 1761, as published in the combination *Papilio coridon* (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera) (specific name of type species of *Lysandra* Hemming, 1933), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology*... 283

cornuelianus d'Orbigny, 1841, *Ammonites* (Class Cephalopoda, Order Ammonoidea), designation of, under the Plenary Powers, to be the type species of *Cheloniceras* Hyatt, 1903... 278–280

proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* ... 280

coronatum Rouchadzé, 1932, as published in the combination *Douvilleiceras coronatum* (Class Cephalopoda, Order Ammonoidea), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 280

Coronuligenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Corvus Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Aves), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, with *Corvus corax* Linnaeus, 1758, as type species 70–73

gender of name 73

Page

corydon (emend. of *coridon*) Poda, 1761, as published in the combination *Papilio corydon*, proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* 283

Coturnix Brisson, 1760, proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers, for the purposes both of the Law of Priority and of the Law of Homonymy 89–91

proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 92

Coturnix Bonnaterre, 1790 (Class Aves), proposed validation of, under the Plenary Powers and confirmation of position of, on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* 89–92

advertisement of the above proposal 3

Coturnix Nozeman & Vosmaer, 1758, proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 91–92

Crassatelligenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Crenatuligenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Creniigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Crepiduligenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

cristatus Linnaeus, 1758, *Colymbus* (Class Aves), proposed designation, under the Plenary Powers, to be the type species of *Podiceps* Latham, 1787 6–7, 8–14

proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* ... 7, 13

cristatus Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Pavo cristatus* (Class Aves), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 70–75

Cucullaeigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Page

Cuculus Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Aves), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, with *Cuculus canorus* Linnaeus, 1758, as type species 70–73

gender of name 73

Curtis (J.), 1837, *A Guide to an Arrangement of British Insects* (2nd Edition), proposed rejection of, for purposes of Rule (g) in Article 30, or alternatively suppression of, under the Plenary Powers for the above purposes... ... 353

proposed addition of title of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Works in Zoological Nomenclature*, with an endorsement as recommended above 354

support for adoption of the first of the alternatives proposed ... 355–356

proposed addition of title of, to the *Official List of Works Approved as Available for Zoological Nomenclature*, subject to the exclusion therefrom of the portion rejected as unavailable for the purposes of Rule (g) in Article 30 356

curvirostra Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Loxia curvirostra* (Class Aves), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 70–75

cyanea Müller, 1776, as published in the combination *Muscicapa cyanea* (Class Aves), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 104–105

cyanea Vieillot, 1818, as published in the combination *Muscicapa cyanea* (Class Aves), proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers, for the purposes of the Law of Homonymy... 104

proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* 105

cyanea Hume, 1877, as published in the combination *Muscitrea cyanea* (Class Aves), proposed validation of, under the Plenary Powers and addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 104–105

advertisement of the above proposal 3

Cycladigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Cyclostomigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Page

Cypraeigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Cystia Renier, [1807] (Phylum Mollusca), question whether validation of, under the Plenary Powers desirable 257–262

advertisement of the above proposal 256

proposed addition of, if not so validated, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262, 264

Cystigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Cytherigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

dama Linnaeus, 1758, *Cervus* (Class Mammalia), proposed designation of, under the Plenary Powers, to be the type species of *Dama* Frisch, 1775 297, 298, 300

proposed designation of, under the Plenary Powers, to be the type species of *Dama* Hamilton Smith, 1827 300

proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 297, 298

Dama Frisch, 1775 (Class Mammalia), proposed validation of, under the Plenary Powers, with *Cervus dama* Linnaeus, 1758, as the type species 293–297, 298

advertisement of the above proposal 288

gender of name 297

proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* 297, 298

support for the above proposal 299, 300

Dama Zimmermann, 1777, a name published in a work rejected for nomenclatorial purposes, proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 297

proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers... 299–300

Dama Zimmermann, 1780, a junior homonym of *Dama* Frisch, 1775, proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 297

Page

Dama Gray (J. E.), 1825, proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 297

Dama Smith (C. H.), 1827, a junior homonym of *Dama* Frisch, 1775, proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 297

as counter-proposal, proposed validation of, under the Plenary Powers, to be the name for the genus containing the Fallow Deer of Europe, with *Cervus dama* Linnaeus, 1758, as type species 299–300

as counter-proposal, proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* 300

Dama Gray (J. E.), 1850, a junior homonym of *Dama* Frisch, 1775, proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 297

Dasypeltis Wagler, 1830 (Class Reptilia), support for the proposed validation of 157

Declarations containing interpretations of provisions in the *Règles*, proposed adoption of, see *Règles Internationales de la Nomenclature Zoologique.*

Delphinuligenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

dentatus Diesing, 1839, as published in the combination *Stephanurus dentatus* (Class Nematoda), comments regarding proposed suppression of 141–142, 143, 144

depicta Renier, [1807], as published in the combination *Aglaja depicta*, proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* 262

Diceratigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Diloba Boisduval, 1840 (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera), comment regarding proposed validation of 145

DISCIADIDAE (emend. of DISCIDAE) Rathbun, 1902 (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology*, with *Discias* Rathbun, 1902, as type genus ... 332–333

Page

Discias Rathbun, 1902 (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda), proposed validation of, under the Plenary Powers 332

advertisement of the above proposal 320

gender of name 332

proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, with *Discias serrifer* Rathbun, 1902, as type species... 333

DISCIDAE Rathbun, 1902, proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family-Group Names in Zoology* 333

DISCIIDA Lebour, 1949, proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family-Group Names in Zoology*... 333

Discoides Renier, [1804] (Phylum Mollusca), question whether validation of, under the Plenary Powers desirable 257–262, 263

advertisement of the above contingency 253

proposed addition of, if not so validated, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

divisa Renier, [1807], as published in the combination *Tuba divisa*, proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* 262

Doliigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

dominica Linnaeus, 1776, as published in the combination *Loxia dominica*, question of addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* 68–69

Donacigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Douvilleiceras de Grossouvre, 1893 (Class Cephalopoda), proposed setting aside, under the Plenary Powers, of all previous type selections for, and designation of *Ammonites mammilatus* Schlotheim, 1813, as type species 250–254

advertisement of the above proposal... 224

gender of name 254

proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* ... 254

Page

Eburnigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Ecclissa Schrank, 1802, proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy 208–214, 214–217

proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 218

Eclissa Modeer, 1790, proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy 208–214, 214–217

proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 218

Ectopistes Swainson, 1827 (Class Aves), proposed determination under the Plenary Powers of identity of *Columba migratoria* Linnaeus, 1766, type species of 80–83

Edwards (G.), *Nat. Hist. Birds*, proposed designation, under the Plenary Powers, of a description and a figure in, to represent the lectotype of *Columba macroura* Linnaeus, 1758 83

Egeon Bosc, 1813, a junior homonym of *Egeon* de Montfort, 1808, proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 339

Egeon Risso, 1816, a junior homonym of *Egeon* de Montfort, 1808, proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 339

Egretta Brisson, 1760, proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers, for the purposes both of the Law of Priority and of the Law of Homonymy 89–91

proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 92

Egretta Forster, 1817 (Class Aves), proposed validation of, under the Plenary Powers and confirmation of position of, on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* 89–92

advertisement of the above proposal 3

Page

cimeensis Gmelin (J. F.), [1789], as published in the combination *Columba cimeensis*, proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy 40–41

advertisement of the above proposal 3

proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* 41

elegans Forster (J. R.), 1794, as published in the combination *Motacilla elegans*, proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers, for the purposes both of the Law of Priority and of the Law of Homonymy 44, 45–46, 50–51

advertisement of the above proposal 3

proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* 44, 51

elegans Gould (J.), 1837, as published in the combination *Malurus elegans* (Class Aves), proposed validation of, under the Plenary Powers ... 44, 45–46

proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* ... 44, 51

Emarginuligenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

epops Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Upupa epops* (Class Aves), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 70–75

ericetorum Turton, 1807, as published in the combination *Turdus ericetorum*, proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy ... 62, 63–64

proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* 64

Erycinigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Etheriigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Euasteroceras Donovan, 1953, proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 348

Page

europaeus Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Caprimulgus europaeus* (Class Aves), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 70–75

falcolinus Linnaeus, 1776, as published in the combination *Tetrao falcolinus*, question of addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* 68–69

familiaris Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Certhia familiaris* (Class Aves), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 70–75

Fasciolarigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Favus Schafheutel, 1850, proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers, for the purposes both of the Law of Priority and of the Law of Homonymy 119–120

proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 120

Favus Lanchester, 1900 (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda), proposed validation of, under the Plenary Powers and confirmation of, on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* 119–120

gender of name 120

advertisement of the above proposal... 109

support for the above proposal... 121

ferruginea Merrem, 1784, as published in the combination *Muscicapa ferruginea* proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers, for the purposes both of the Law of Priority and of the Law of Homonymy 105–106

proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* 106

ferruginea Hodgson, June 1844, as published in the combination *Hemichelidon ferruginea* Hodgson, 1844, proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* 106

ferruginea Hodgson, 1845, as published in the combination *Hemichelidon ferruginea* (Class Aves), proposed validation of, under the Plenary Powers, and addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology*... 105–106

advertisement of the above proposal 3

Page

Fissurelligenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Fistulanigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

flava Vieillot, 1817, as published in the combination *Campephaga flava* (Class Aves), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 32

flavescens Lichtenstein, 1793, as published in the combination *Lanius flavescens*, proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy 32–33

- advertisement of the above proposal... 3
- proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* 33

flavipes Fabricius, 1792, as published in the combination *Dytiscus flavipes*, proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers, for the purposes both of the Law of Priority and of the Law of Homonymy... 128–129

- proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* 130

flavipes Olivier, 1795, as published in the combination *Dytiscus flavipes* (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera), proposed validation of, under the Plenary Powers and addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 128–130

- advertisement of the above proposal... 109

fluviatilis Fabricius, 1775, *Astacus*, proposed suppression of, and addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* 114–117

Formica Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera) proposed designation, under the Plenary Powers, of *Formica rufa* Linnaeus, 1761, to be type species of 316

- gender of name 312
- proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* ... 316

FORMICAEDES Billberg, 1820, proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family-Group Names in Zoology* 312

Page

FORMICARIDES Leach, 1815, proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family-Group Names in Zoology* 312

FORMICIDAE (correction of FORMICARIAE) Latreille, [1802–1803] (first published in the correct form as FORMICIDAE by Stephens (J.F.), 1829), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology*, with *Formica* Linnaeus, 1758, as type genus... 312

Forster (J. R.), proposed suppression, for nomenclatorial purposes, of a paper containing new names for certain Australian birds published in Vol. 5 of *Magazin von Merkwürdigen neuen Reise Beschreibungen*, 1794 ... 45

Fringilla Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Aves), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, with *Fringilla coelebs* Linnaeus, 1758, as type species 70–73

gender of name 73

Fulica Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Aves), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, with *Fulica atra* Linnaeus, 1758, as type species 70–73

gender of name 73

Fusigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

GALATEADAE Samouelle, 1819, proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family-Group Names in Zoology* 339

Galateigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

galathea Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Papilio galathea* (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 222

Galathea Fabricius, 1793 (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*... ... 337–338

GALATHEIDAE (emend. of GALATEADAE) Samouelle, 1819 (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology*, with *Galathea* Fabricius, 1793, as type genus ... 339

Page

Galgulus Brisson, 1760, proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology*... 61

Galgulus Latreille, [1802–1803], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 61

Galgulus Wagler, 1827, proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 61

Galgulus Kittlitz, 1832, proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 61

gallinago Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Scolopax gallinago* (Class Aves), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 95

Gallinago Brisson, 1760, proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy 93–95

proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 95

Gallinago Koch, 1816 (Class Aves), proposed removal of, from the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* 93–95

proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 95

gallopavo Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Meleagris gallopavo* (Class Aves), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 70–75

garrulus Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Coracias garrulus* (Class Aves), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 57–60

Gavia, all uses of prior to *Gavia* Forster, 1788, proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers, for the purposes both of the Law of Priority and of the Law of Homonymy... 13

advertisement of the above proposal... 3

proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 14

Page

Gavia Brisson, 1760, proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers, for the purposes both of the Law of Priority and of the Law of Homonymy and addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 14

Gavia Gmelin (S. G.), [1770], proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers, for the purposes both of the Law of Priority and of the Law of Homonymy and addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 14

Gavia Forster, 1788 (Class Aves), proposed setting aside, under the Plenary Powers, of all previous type selections for and designation of *Colymbus immer* Brünnich, 1764, to be the type species of 6–7, 8–14

gender of name 13

proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* ... 7, 14

Gavia Oken, 1816, proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 14

Gavia Boie, 1822, proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 14

Gavia Gloger, 1842, proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology*... 14

Gebia Leach, 1815, a junior objective synonym of *Upogebia* Leach, 1814, proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 339

GEBIDAE Dana, 1852, proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy 341

proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family-Group Names in Zoology* 340, 341

GEBIIDAE (emend. of GEBIDAE) Dana, 1852, proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family-Group Names in Zoology* ... 340

Gerbios Bosc, 1813, proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy 334–338

proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 339

Page

globifera Linnaeus, 1776, as published in the combination *Crax globifera*, question of the addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* 68–69

Glycimerigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

granulatus Lanchester, 1900, as published in the combination *Favus granulatus* (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 119–120

Gryphaea Lamarck, 1819 (Class Pelecypoda), support for proposed validation of 145–146

Gryphaeigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Haliotidigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

harmonicus Latham, 1801, as published in the combination *Turdus harmonicus* (Class Aves), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 51

Harpigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

HECTARTHROPIDAE Bate, 1888, proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy, and addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family-Group Names in Zoology* 341

heinei Finsch & Hartlaub, 1870, as published in the combination *Myolestes heinei* (Class Aves), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 41

Helicella Lamarck, 1812, proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 308

Page

Helicella Férussac, 1821 (Class Gastropoda), proposed validation of, under the Plenary Powers 301–303, 304–307

advertisement of the above proposal... 288

proposed setting aside, under the Plenary Powers, of all previous type selections, and designation of *Helix itala* Linnaeus, 1758, to be the type species of 301–303, 304–307

proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* 303, 307

gender of name 303, 307

HELICELLINAE Chenu, 1859, proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family-Group Names in Zoology* 308

HELICELLINAE Schlesch, 1927, proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology*, with *Helicella* Férussac, 1821, as type genus 308

Helicigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Helicinigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Helmitheros Rafinesque, 1819 (Class Aves), proposed validation of, under the Plenary Powers and addition of, to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* with *Motacilla vermivora* Gmelin, [1789], as type species... ... 65–67

gender of name 66

Hippopigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Hirundigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

hirundo Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Sterna hirundo* (Class Aves), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 70–75

hortulana Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Tipula hortulana* (Class Insecta, Order Diptera), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 246

Page

hyacinthina Temminck, 1820, as published in the combination *Muscicapa hyacinthina* (Class Aves), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 104–105

Hyalopterus Koch, 1854 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, with *Aphis pruni* Geoffroy, 1762, as type species... 165

hybrida Linnaeus, 1776, as published in the combination *Meleagris hybrida*, question of addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* 68–69

Ianthinigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Imisigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

immer Brünnich, 1764, *Colymbus* (Class Aves), proposed designation of, under the Plenary Powers, to be the type species of *Gavia* Forster, 1788... 6–7, 8–14

proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* ... 7, 14

immigrans Sturtevant, 1921, as published in the combination *Drosophila immigrans* (Class Insecta, Order Diptera), proposed validation of, under the Plenary Powers 161–162

advertisement of the above proposal... 160

comment on the above proposal 342–343, 343–344

support for the above proposal 344–345, 345, 346

proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* ... 162

incisus Leach, 1814, as published in the combination *Cancer incisus* (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 271

incurva Renier, [1807], as published in the combination *Eulima incurva*, proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* 262

Isocardigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Page

itala Linnaeus, 1758, *Helix* (Class Gastropoda), proposed designation of, under the Plenary Powers, to be the type species of *Helicella* Férussac, 1821 301–303, 304–307

proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 303, 308

Jacosta Gray (J. E.), 1821, proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy 306–307

proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 308

Janira Risso, 1816, a junior objective synonym of *Melia* Bosc, 1813, and a junior homonym of *Janira* Leach, 1814, proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 339

japonicus de Haan, 1841, as published in, the combination *Astacus japonicus* (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 117

Key, K. H. L., see Commission, International, on Zoological Nomenclature, Membership of

Kühnelt, Wilhelm, see Commission, International, on Zoological Nomenclature, Membership of

lachesis Hübner, 1790, as published in the combination *Papilio lachesis* (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 222

Lachnus Burmeister, 1835 (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera), proposed setting aside, under the Plenary Powers, of all previous type selections for, and designation of *Aphis roboris* Linnaeus, 1758, as type species... ... 174–183

advertisement of the above proposal 160

Report on the above proposal 184–187

proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* ... 183

Page

lamellosus Parkinson, 1811, as published in the combination *Trigonellites lamellosus,* proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers ... 266–268

advertisement of the above proposal 256

proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* 268

latus Parkinson, 1811, as published in the combination *Trigonellites latus,* proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers... 266–268

advertisement of the above proposal 256

proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* 268

Leptodius Milne Edwards (A.), 1863 (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda), proposed amplification of entry concerning, in the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* 271

leucoptera Pallas, 1811, as published in the combination *Alauda leucoptera* (Class Aves), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 77–79

ligniperda Latreille, 1802, as published in the combination *Formica ligniperda* (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 312

Liguligenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Limigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Linnaeus, 1776, *Catalogue of the Birds, Beasts, Fishes, Insects, Plants, etc., contained in Edwards' Natural History,* proposed use of the Plenary Powers for the suppression of new Linnean names published in 65–67

comment on the above proposal 68–69

Linza Schrank, 1802, proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy 208–214, 214–217

proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 218

Page

listeri Mantell, 1822, as published in the combination *Belemnites listeri* (Class Cephalopoda, Order Dibranchia), proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy 284–285

proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* 285

Loxia Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Aves), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, with *Loxia curvirostra* Linnaeus, 1758, as type species 70–73

gender of name 73

Lucinigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Lupa Leach, 1814, proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 127

lutea Linnaeus, 1776, as published in the combination *Muscicapa lutea* (Class Aves), proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers, for the purposes both of the Law of Priority and of the Law of Homonymy... 65–67

advertisement of the above proposal 3

proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* 65

comment on the above proposals 68–69

Lutrarigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Lymneigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Lysandra Hemming, 1933 (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, with *Papilio coridon* Poda, 1761, as type species 283

Macropipus Prestandrea, 1833 (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, with *Portunus macropipus* Prestandrea, 1833, as type species 122–127

gender of name 127

Page

macroura Linnaeus, 1758, *Columba* (Class Aves), proposed designation, under the Plenary Powers, of a description and figure in Edwards (G.), *Nat. Hist. Birds,* to represent the lectotype of 83

proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* ... 84

Mactrigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

macula Renier, [1807], as published in the combination *Acicula macula,* proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology*... 262

magnolia Wilson, 1811, as published in the combination *Sylvia magnolia* (Class Aves), proposed validation of, under the Plenary Powers, to be the name of the Magnolia Warbler, and addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 65–67

Malleigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

mammillaris d'Orbigny, 1841, as published in the combination *Ammonites mammillaris,* proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* 254

mamillaris [sic] de Grossouvre, 1893, as published in the combination *Douvilleiceras mamillaris,* proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* 254

mammillatus Schlotheim, 1813, *Ammonites* (Class Cephalopoda), proposed designation, under the Plenary Powers, of specimen figured as figs. 3a and 3b on plate 4 in Spath, 1923, *A Monograph of the Gault Ammonoidea,* as the neotype of 250–253

proposed designation of, under the Plenary Powers, as the type species of *Douvilleiceras* de Grossouvre, 1893... 250–254

advertisement of the above proposals... 224

proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* ... 254

marginata Linnaeus, 1766, as published in the combination *Columba marginata,* proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* 84

marginatus Renier, [1804], as published in the combination *Cerebratulus marginatus,* proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* 262

Page

Marginelligenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology*... 262

Mayr, Ernst, see Commission, International, on Zoological Nomenclature, Membership of

Megastropha Walker, 1918, an Invalid Subsequent Spelling of *Megasystropha* Lea, 1864, proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 326, 328

Megasystropha Lea, 1864, proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for the Law of Homonymy 321–325, 326–327

proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 326, 328

Megatyloceras Humphrey, 1949 (Class Cephalopoda, Order Ammonoidea), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, with *Douvilleiceras coronatum* Rouchadzé, 1932, as type species... 280

gender of name 280

Meigen, 1800, *Nouvelle Classification des Mouches à Deux Ailes*, proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers, analysis of comments received in reply to questionnaire on 225–240

Melanargia Meigen, 1828 (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera), proposed validation of, under the Plenary Powers 221–222

advertisement of the above proposal... 192

gender of name 222

support for the above proposal... ... ... 222, 285

proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, with *Papilio galathea* Linnaeus, 1758, as type species... 222

Melanigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Meleagris Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Aves), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, with *Meleagris gallopavo* Linnaeus, 1758, as type species 70–73

gender of name 73

Page

Mellita as from Agassiz, 1841 (Class Echinoidea), support for the proposed validation of 158

Merops Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Aves), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, with *Merops apiaster* Linnaeus, 1758, as type species 70–73

gender of name 73

migratoria Linnaeus, 1766, as published in the combination *Columba migratoria*, (Class Aves), proposed determination under the Plenary Powers of identity of 80–84

advertisement of the above proposal... 3

proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* ... 84

Miller, Alden H., see Commission, International, on Zoological Nomenclature, Membership of

minimus Miller (J. S.), 1826, as published in the combination *Belemnites minimus* (Class Cephalopoda, Order Dibranchia), proposed validation of, under the Plenary Powers 284

advertisement of the above proposal... 256

support for the above proposal 350

proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* ... 285

Mitrigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Modioligenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Monacha Fitzinger, 1833 (Class Gastropoda), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, with *Helix cartusiana* Müller (O. F.), 1774, as type species 307

gender of name 307

Monodontigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Page

Motacilla Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Aves), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, with *Motacilla alba* Linnaeus, 1758, as type species 70–73

gender of name 73

muelleri Ehrenberg, 1832, *Stentor* (Class Ciliophora, Sub-Class Ciliata), proposed interpretation of, under the Plenary Powers 216–217

proposed designation of, to be the type species of *Stentor* Oken, 1815 ... 217

proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* ... 218

Muensteria Eudes-Deslongchamps, 1835, proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers 266–268

advertisement of the above proposal... 256

proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 268

Muricigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Myigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Myiobius Darwin, 1839 (Class Aves), proposed setting aside, under the Plenary Powers, of all previous type selections for, and designation of *Muscicapa barbata* Gmelin, 1788, as type species 98–100

advertisement of the above proposal... 3

proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* ... 100

Mytiligenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Mytilus Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Pelecypoda), support for proposed determination of type species of 144

Nassigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Page

Natichigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

natka Gmelin (J. F.), 1788, as published in the combination *Lanius natka*, proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy 40–41

advertisement of the above proposal 3

proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* 41

Nemotelus Geoffroy, 1762 (Class Insecta, Order Diptera), proposed validation of, under the Plenary Powers 241–245

advertisement of the above proposal... 224

support for the above proposal... 269

gender of name 245

proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, with *Musca pantherina* Linnaeus, 1758, as type species 245–246

Neptunus De Haan, 1833, proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 122–127

Neritinigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

newberryi Lea, 1858, as published in the combination *Planorbis newberryi* (Class Gastropoda), type species of *Carinifex* Binney, 1865, proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology*... ... 326, 328

nigricollis Brehm, 1831, as published in the combination *Podiceps nigricollis* (Class Aves), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 30

NIKIDAE Bate, 1888, proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy, and addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family-Group Names in Zoology*... 341

niobe-cydippe-adippe problem, (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera), comments on proposed solution of 131, 133, 134, 136, 138

Page

nivea Renier, [1807], as published in the combination *Cystia nivea*, proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology*... 262

nortoniensis Gmelin (J. F.), [1789], as published in the combination *Fringilla nortoniensis*, proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy, and addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* 38–39

advertisement of the above proposal 3

notata Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Tipula notata* (Class Insecta, Order Diptera), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 246

Notropis Rafinesque, 1818 (Class Osteichthyes), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, with *Notropis atherinoides* Rafinesque, 1818, as type species 272

proposed use of the Plenary Powers to determine gender of name ... 272–274

advertisement of the above proposal... 256

objection to proposal of masculine gender and counter-proposal of acceptance as feminine gender 274–275

report on the above proposals 276–277

novaehollandiae Latham, 1790, as published in the combination *Muscicapa novaehollandiae*, proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy 47–49, 50–51

advertisement of the above proposal... 51

proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* 51

Nuculigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

nudus Mordvilko, 1895, as published in the combination *Lachnus nudus*, proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* 173

Page

nutans Renier, [1804], as published in the combination *Discoides nutans*, proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* ... 262

nyctelea Linnaeus, 1776, as published in the combination *Strix nyctelea*, question of addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* ... 68–69

ochropus, proposed emendation to, of *ocrophus* Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Tringa ocrophus* (Class Aves) ... 52

proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* ... 52

ocrophus Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Tringa ocrophus*, proposed emendation of, to *ochropus* (Class Aves) ... 52

Odocoileus Rafinesque, 1832 (Class Mammalia), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, with *Odocoileus speleus* Rafinesque, 1832, as type species ... 297, 298

gender of name ... 297

support for the above proposal ... 299, 300

Oedicnemus Temminck, 1815 (Class Aves), proposed removal of, from the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* ... 88

Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family-Group Names in Zoology, names proposed to be added to:

DISCIDAE Rathbun, 1902 ... 333
DISCIIDA Lebour, 1949 ... 333
FORMICAEDES Billberg, 1820 ... 312
FORMICARIDES Leach, 1815 ... 312
GALATEADAE Samouelle, 1819 ... 339
GEBIDAE Dana, 1852 ... 340, 341
GEBIIDAE (emend. of GEBIDAE) Dana, 1852 ... 340
HECTARTHROPIDAE Bate, 1888 ... 341
HELICELLINAE Chenu, 1859 ... 308
NIKIDAE Bate, 1888 ... 341
PILUMNIDAE Samouelle, 1819 ... 331
THALASSINIDES Latreille, 1831 ... 340

Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology, names proposed to be added to:
Achatinigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Agapetes Billberg, 1820 ... 222
Aglaja Renier, [1807] ... 262, 264

Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology, names proposed to be added to (*continued*) :

Page
Alcyonaria Renier, [1807] ... 262, 264
Amphibulimigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Ampullarigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Anatifigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Anatinigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Ancilligenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Anisocaris Ortmann, 1893 ... 333
Anodontigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Anomigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Aptychus Meyer, 1831 ... 268
Aptycus Deshayes, 1845 ... 268
Archigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Arenarigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Arge Hübner, [1819] ... 221–222
Argus Bohadsch, 1761 ... 283
Aspergilligenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Astacus, all uses of prior to *Astacus* Fabricius, 1775 ... 117
Astacus Pallas, 1772 ... 117
Astacus Erichson, 1847 ... 117
Auriculigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Balanigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Bubo Brisson, 1760 ... 92
Bubo Rambur, 1842 ... 92
Buccinigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Bulimigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Bulligenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Calceoligenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Calypso Risso, 1816 ... 339
Calyptraeigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Cancellarigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Capella Keyserling & Blasius, 1840 ... 95
Capsigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Cardigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Carditigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Carinifex Binney, 1863 ... 326, 328
Carnifex Keep, 1893 ... 326, 328
Cassigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Cerebratulus Renier, [1804] ... 262
Cerithiigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Chamigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Chitonigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Cinaria Baker, 1920 ... 183
Clavatuligenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Columbelligenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Colymbus Linnaeus, 1758 ... 7, 14
Colymbus Paetel, 1875 ... 14
Colymbus Hadding, 1913 ... 14
Concolepadigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Conigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Coracia Brisson, 1760 ... 60
Coracia Hübner, [1819] ... 61
Coracia Moerch, 1865 ... 61
Coracias Herrmannsen, 1847 ... 59, 61
Corbuligenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Coronuligenus Renier, [1807] ... 262

Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology, names proposed to be added to (*continued*) :

Page
Coturnix Brisson, 1760 ... 92
Coturnix Nozeman & Vosmaer (*in* Moehring), 1758 ... 91–92
Crassatelligenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Crenatuligenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Creniigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Crepiduligenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Cucullaeigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Cycladigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Cyclostomigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Cypraeigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Cystia Renier, [1807] ... 262, 264
Cystigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Cytherigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Dama Zimmerman, 1777 ... 297
Dama Zimmermann, 1780 ... 297
Dama Gray (J. E.), 1825 ... 297
Dama Smith (C. H.), 1827 ... 297
Dama Gray (J. E.), 1850 ... 297
Delphinuligenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Diceratigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Discoides Renier, [1804] ... 262
Doliigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Donacigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Eburnigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Ecclissa Schrank, 1802 ... 218
Eclissa Modeer, 1790 ... 218
Egeon Bosc, 1813 ... 339
Egeon Risso, 1816 ... 339
Egretta Brisson, 1760 ... 92
Emarguligenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Erycinigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Etheriigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Euasteroceras Donovan, 1953 ... 348
Fasciolarigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Favus Schafheutel, 1850 ... 120
Fissurelligenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Fistulanigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Fusigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Galateigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Galgulus Brisson, 1760 ... 57, 61
Galgulus Latreille, [1802–1803] ... 59, 61
Galgulus Wagler, 1827 ... 59, 61
Galgulus Kittlitz, 1832 ... 59, 61
Gallinago Brisson, 1760 ... 95
Gallinago Koch, 1816 ... 95
Gavia, all uses of prior to *Gavia* Forster, 1788 ... 14
Gavia Brisson, 1760 ... 14
Gavia Gmelin (S. G.), [1770] ... 14
Gavia Oken, 1816 ... 14
Gavia Boie, 1822 ... 14
Gavia Gloger, 1842 ... 14
Gebia Leach, 1815 ... 339
Gerbios Bosc, 1813 ... 339
Glycimerigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262

Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology, names proposed to be added to (*continued*) :

Page
Gryphaeigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Haliotidigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Harpigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Helicella Lamarck, 1812 ... 308
Helicigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Helicinigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Hippopigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Hirundigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Ianthinigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Imisigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Isocardigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Jacosta Gray (J. E.), 1821 ... 308
Janira Risso, 1816 ... 339
Liguligenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Limigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Linza Schrank, 1802 ... 218
Lucinigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Lupa Leach, 1814 ... 127
Lutrarigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Lymneigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Mactrigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Malleigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Marginelligenus Renier, [1807]... 262
Megastropha Walker, 1918 ... 326, 328
Megasystropha Lea, 1864 ... 326, 328
Melanigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Mitrigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Modioligenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Monodontigenus Renier, [1807]... 262
Muensteria Eudes-Deslongchamps, 1835 ... 268
Muricigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Myigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Mytiligenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Nassigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Natichigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Neptunus De Haan, 1833 ... 127
Neritinigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Nuculigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Olivigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Orbiculigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Oriolus Brisson, 1760 ... 92
Ostreigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Ovuligenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Palmatotriton Smith, 1945 ... 249
Pandorigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Panopeigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Patelligenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Pectinigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Pectunculigenus Renier, [1807]... 262
Pedigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Pernigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Petricoligenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Phasianelligenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Pholadigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262

Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology, names proposed to be added to (*continued*):

Page
Pinnigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Planatella Clessin, 1876 ... 308
Plancunigenus [sic] Renier, [1807] ... 262
Planorbigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Planospirigenus Renier, [1807]... 262
Pleurotomigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Plicatuligenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Polycitor Renier, [1804]... 262
Portunus Fabricius, 1798 ... 127
Pterocerigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Pupigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Purpurigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Pyramidelligenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Pyrrhocorax Moehring, 1758 ... 58
Pyrrhocorax Nozeman & Vosmaer (*in* Moehring), 1758 ... 58, 61
Pyrrhocorax Brisson, 1760 ... 61
Pyrrhocorax Vieillot, 1816 ... 59, 61
Pyruligenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Radiolithigenus Renier, [1807]... 262
Rodens Renier, [1807] ... 262, 264
Rostellariigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Rupellarigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Sanguinolarigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Saxicavigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Scalarigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Scathopse Geoffroy, 1762 ... 246
Scolixedion Renier, [1804] ... 262, 263
Sigaretigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Siliquarigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Solarigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Solenigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Solenites Schlotheim, 1820 ... 268
Solennites Schlotheim, 1813 ... 268
Spondyligenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Stentor Geoffroy de St. Hilaire, 1812 ... 218
Stentorella Reichenbach, 1828 ... 218
Stomatiigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Strombigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Tellinigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Terebelligenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Terebratuligenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Terebrigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Teredigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Testacelligenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Thalassalpes Bosc, 1813 ... 339
Tinea Geoffroy, 1762 ... 152
Tricelia Renier, [1870] ... 262, 264
Tridacnigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Trigonellites Parkinson, 1811 ... 268
Trigonigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Trochigenus Renier, [1807] ... 262
Tuba Renier, [1807] ... 262, 264
Tubaria Thienemann, 1828 ... 218
Tubicinelligenus Renier, [1807] ... 262

Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology, names proposed to be added to (*continued*) :

Page

Tubulanus Renier [1807] 262, 264
Turbinelligenus Renier, [1807] 262
Turbinigenus Renier, [1807] 262
Turritelligenus Renier, [1807] 262
Tyrannula Swainson, May 1827 10
Ungulinigenus Renier, [1807] 262
Uniigenus Renier, [1807] 262
Venericardigenus Renier, [1807] 262
Venerigenus Renier, [1807] 262
Vermicularigenus Renier, [1807] 262
Vermivora Linnaeus, 1776 65
Volutigenus Renier, [1807] 262
Volvarigenus Renier, [1807] 262
Vulselligenus Renier, [1807] 262
Xantho Dutrochet, 1819 271
Xanthus Agassiz, 1843 271
Xerophila Held, 1837 308

Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology, names proposed to be added to :

americ. [sic] Linnaeus, 1776, *Vermivora* 65
araracina Linnaeus, 1776, *Psittacus* 68–69
armillatus Renier, [1807], *Rodens* 262
australis Gmelin (J. F.), [1789], *Sterna* 41
bicator Linnaeus, 1776, *Coracias* 68–69
bilineatus Renier, [1804], *Cerebratulus* 262
borealis Gmelin (J. F.), [1789] *Motacilla* 41
brouni Hutton, 1901, *Drosophila* 162
cafer Lichtenstein, 1793, *Cuculus* 33
cafra Lichtenstein, 1793, *Otis* 33
calidris Linnaeus, 1776, *Motacitta* [sic] 68–69
candidus Renier, [1807], *Solecurtus* 262
caspicus Hablizl, 1783, *Colymbus* 30
chlorotis Forster, 1794, *Muscicapa* 51
cinereus Linnaeus, 1776, *Todos* [sic] 68–69
cirrhatus Gmelin (J. F.), [1789], *Pelecanus* 41
corydon (emend. of *coridon*) Poda, 1761, *Papilio* 283
cyanea Vieillot, 1818, *Muscicapa* 105
depicta Renier, [1807], *Aglaja* 262
divisa Renier, [1807], *Tuba* 262
dominica Linnaeus, 1776, *Loxia* 68–69
eimeensis Gmelin (J. F.), [1789], *Columba* 41
elegans Forster (J. R.), 1794, *Motacilla* 44, 51
ericetorum Turton, 1807, *Turdus* 64
falcolinus Linnaeus, 1776, *Tetrao* 68–69
ferruginea Merrem, 1784, *Muscicapa* 106
ferruginea Hodgson, June 1844, *Hemichelidon* 106
flavescens Lichtenstein, 1793, *Lanius* 33
flavipes Fabricius, 1792, *Dytiscus* 130
fluviatilis Fabricius, 1775, *Astacus* 114–117
globifera Linnaeus, 1776, *Crax* 68–69
hybrida Linnaeus, 1776, *Meleagris* 68–69

Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology, names proposed to be added to (*continued*):

Page
incurva Renier, [1807], *Eulima* ... 262
lamellosus Parkinson, 1811, *Trigonellites* ... 268
latus Parkinson, 1811, *Trigonellites* ... 268
listeri Mantell, 1822, *Belemnites* ... 285
lutea Linnaeus, 1776, *Muscicapa* ... 65
macula Renier, [1807], *Acicula* ... 262
mamillaris [sic] de Grossouvre, 1893, *Douvilleiceras* ... 254
mammillaris d'Orbigny, 1841, *Ammonites* ... 254
marginata Linnaeus, 1766 *Columba* ... 84
marginatus Renier, [1804] *Cerebratulus* ... 262
natka Gmelin (J. F.), 1788, *Lanius* ... 41
nivea Renier, [1807], *Cystia* ... 262
nortoniensis Gmelin (J. F.), [1789], *Fringilla* ... 38–39
novaehollandiae Latham, 1790, *Muscicapa* ... 51
nudus Mordvilko, 1895, *Lachnus* ... 173
nutans Renier, [1804], *Discoides* ... 262
nyctelea Linnaeus, 1776, *Strix* ... 68–69
pensylvanica Linnaeus, 1776, *Passer* ... 65
penulatum Renier, [1804], *Scolixedion* ... 262
phaeus Forster, 1794, *Turdus* ... 51
polymorphus Renier, [1807], *Tubulanus* ... 262
royerianus d'Orbigny, 1841, *Ammonites* ... 279
rufa Linnaeus, 1758, *Formica* ... 312
saghalinensis Yamashina, 1931, *Dryobates leucotos* ... 103
senegallensis Linnaeus, 1776, *Picus* ... 68–69
septentrionalis Gmelin (J. F.), 1788, *Lanius* ... 41
serrata Renier, [1807], *Tellina* ... 262
sibirica Gmelin (J.F.), [1789], *Alauda* ... 77–79
solitarius Oken, 1815, *Stentor* ... 218
spectrum Linnaeus, 1776, *Psittacus* ... 68–69
stentorea (emend. of *stentoria*) Linnaeus, 1767, *Hydra* ... 218
stentoria Linnaeus, 1758, *Hydra* ... 218
sulphuratus Lichtenstein, 1793, *Cuculus* ... 33
tianshanicus Buturlin, 1910, *Dendrocopus* [sic] *major* ... 103
tricolorata Renier, [1807], *Aglaja* ... 262
umbellatus Linnaeus, 1776, *Tetrao* ... 68–69
unalaschkensis Gmelin (J.F.), [1789], *Hirundo* ... 41
variopadata Renier, [1807], *Tricelia* ... 262
voarula Linnaeus, 1776, *Motacilla* ... 68–69
zeylonicus Linnaeus, 1776, *Turdus* ... 68–69

Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Works in Zoological Nomenclature, titles of works proposed to be added to:

Binney (W.G.), 1863, *Synopsis of the species of Air-Breathing Mollusks of North America* ... 327
Curtis (J.), 1837, *A Guide to an Arrangement of British Insects* (Edition 2), subject to an endorsement that entry proposed relates only to the purposes of Article 30 ... 354
Renier (S.A.), [1807], *Tavole per servire alla classificazione e connescenza degli Animali* ... 262

Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology, names proposed to be added to :

Page

CALLIANASSIDAE Dana, 1852 ... 339
DISCIADIDAE (emend. of DISCIDAE) Rathbun, 1902 ... 332–333
FORMICIDAE (correction of FORMICARIAE) Latreille, [1802–1803] ... 312
GALATHEIDAE (emend. of GALATEADAE) Samouelle, 1819 ... 339
HELICELLINAE Schlesch, 1927 ... 308
PROCESSIDAE Ortmann, 1896 ... 339
THALASSINIDAE (emend. of THALASSINIDES) Latreille, 1831 ... 339
UPOGEBIINAE Borradaile, 1903 ... 339
XANTHINAE Dana, 1851 ... 331

Official List of Generic Names in Zoology, names already placed on, proposed confirmation of position of :

Bubo Duméril, 1806 ... 92
Coturnix Bonnaterre, 1790 ... 92
Egretta Forster, 1817 ... 92
Favus Lanchester, 1900 ... 120
Oriolus Linnaeus, 1766 ... 90

Official List of Generic Names in Zoology, names proposed to be added to :—

Ancilla Lamarck, 1799 ... 220
Aspidoceras Zittel, 1868 ... 268
Astacus Fabricius, 1775 ... 114–117
Bibio Geoffroy, 1762 ... 246
Burhinus Illiger, 1811 ... 88
Caenisites Buckman (S.S.), 1925 ... 347
Callianassa Leach, 1814 ... 337–338
Cambaroides Faxon, 1884 ... 117
Camponotus Mayr, 1861 ... 312
Capella Frenzel, 1801 ... 95
Caprimulgus Linnaeus, 1758 ... 70–73
Carinifex Binney, 1865 ... 326, 328
Certhia Linnaeus, 1758 ... 70–73
Chelonicerus Hyatt, 1903 ... 280
Cinara Curtis, 1835 ... 183
Coracias Linnaeus, 1758 ... 60
Corvus Linnaeus, 1758 ... 70–73
Cuculus Linnaeus, 1758 ... 70–73
Dama Frisch, 1775 ... 297, 298
Dama Smith (C.H.), 1827 ... 300
Discias Rathbun, 1902 ... 333
Douvilleiceras de Grossouvre, 1893 ... 254
Formica Linnaeus, 1758 ... 316
Fringilla Linnaeus, 1758 ... 70–73
Fulica Linnaeus, 1758 ... 70–73
Galathea Fabricius, 1793 ... 337–338
Gavia Forster, 1788 ... 7, 14
Helicella Férussac, 1821 ... 303, 307
Helmitheros Rafinesque, 1819 ... 65–67
Hyalopterus Koch, 1854 ... 165
Lachnus Burmeister, 1835 ... 183
Leptodius Milne Edwards (A.), 1863 ... 271

Official List of Generic Names in Zoology, names proposed to be added to (*continued*):

Page

Loxia Linnaeus, 1758 ... 70–73
Lysandra Hemming, 1933 ... 283
Macropipus Prestandrea, 1833 ... 122–127
Megatyloceras Humphrey, 1949 ... 280
Melanargia Meigen, 1828 ... 222
Meleagris Linnaeus, 1758 ... 70–73
Merops Linnaeus, 1758 ... 70–73
Monacha Fitzinger, 1833 ... 307
Motacilla Linnaeus, 1758 ... 70–73
Myiobius Darwin, 1839 ... 100
Nemotelus Geoffroy, 1762 ... 246
Notropis Rafinesque, 1818 ... 272
Odocoileus Rafinesque, 1832 ... 297, 298
Oxychilus Fitzinger, 1833 ... 307
Pavo Linnaeus, 1758 ... 70–73
Pelecanus Linnaeus, 1758 ... 70–73
Phalaena Linnaeus, 1758 ... 148
Phasianus Linnaeus, 1758 ... 70–73
Podiceps Latham, 1787 ... 7, 13
Portunus Weber, 1795 ... 122–127
Processa Leach, 1815 ... 338
Pyrrhocorax [Tunstall], 1771 ... 60
Scatopse Geoffroy, 1762 ... 246
Scolopax Linnaeus, 1758 ... 70–74
Stentor Oken, 1815 ... 208–214, 214–218
Sterna Linnaeus, 1758 ... 70–74
Stomoxys Geoffroy, 1762 ... 246
Stratiomys Geoffroy, 1762 ... 246
Thalassina Latreille, 1806 ... 337–338
Theba Risso, 1826 ... 303, 308
Tringa Linnaeus, 1758 ... 70–74
Upogebia Leach, 1814 ... 338
Upupa Linnaeus, 1758 ... 70–74
Volucella Geoffroy, 1762 ... 246
Xantho Leach, 1814 ... 270–271

Official List of Generic Names in Zoology, proposed correction to:

Balaeniceps Gould, 1850, proposed correction of date and place of publication of, and also of the name *rex* Gould, as published in the combination *Balaeniceps rex* (Class Aves), in reference to as type species of... ... 85–86

Official List of Generic Names in Zoology, proposed removal of, from:

Gallinago Koch, 1816 ... 95
Oedicnemus Temminck, 1815 ... 88

Official List of Specific Names in Zoology, names proposed to be added to :

Page
alba Linnaeus, 1758, *Motacilla* ... 70–74
albicollis Gmelin (J.F.), [1789], *Fringilla* ... 65–67
albiventer Lesson, 1831, *Carbo* ... 41
anomalus Herbst, 1804, *Cancer* (*Astacus*) ... 339
apiaster Linnaeus, 1758, *Merops* ... 70–74
astacus Linnaeus, 1758, *Cancer* ... 117
atherinoides Rafinesque, 1818, *Notropis* ... 272
atra Linnaeus, 1758, *Fulica* ... 70–74
barbata Gmelin (J.F.), 1788, *Muscicapa* ... 100
barrowi Gray (J.E.), 1829, *Otis* ... 33
caeneus Buckman (S.S.), 1925, *Caenisites* ... 348
calcitrans Linnaeus, 1758, *Conops* ... 246
camelus Linnaeus, 1758, *Struthio* ... 96–97
canaliculata Leach, 1815, *Processa* ... 339
canorus Linnaeus, 1758, *Cuculus* ... 70–74
carolinensis Linnaeus, 1766, *Columba* ... 84
cartusiana Müller (O.F.), 1774, *Helix* ... 308
cellaria Müller (O.F.), 1774, *Helix* ... 308
cerulea Bennett (F.D.), 1840, *Sterna* ... 41
chamaeleon Linnaeus, 1758, *Musca* ... 246
chrysops Latham, 1801, *Sylvia* ... 51
cinnamomea Lamarck, 1801, *Ancilla* ... 220
clamosus Latham, 1801, *Cuculus* ... 33
coelebs Linnaeus, 1758, *Fringilla* ... 70–74
colchicus Linnaeus, 1758, *Phasianus* ... 70–74
corax Linnaeus, 1758, *Corvus* ... 70–74
coridon Poda, 1761, *Papilio* ... 283
cornuelianus d'Orbigny, 1841, *Ammonites* ... 280
coronatum Rouchadzé, 1932, *Douvilleiceras* ... 280
cristatus Linnaeus, 1758, *Colymbus* ... 7, 13
cristatus Linnaeus, 1758, *Pavo* ... 70–75
curvirostra Linnaeus, 1758, *Loxia* ... 70–75
cyanea Müller, 1776, *Muscicapa* ... 104–105
cyanea Hume, 1877, *Muscitrea* ... 104–105
dama Linnaeus, 1758, *Cervus* ... 297, 298
elegans Gould (J.), 1837, *Malurus* ... 44, 51
epops Linnaeus, 1758, *Upupa* ... 70–75
europaeus Linnaeus, 1758, *Caprimulgus* ... 70–75
familiaris Linnaeus, 1758, *Certhia* ... 70–75
ferruginea Hodgson, 1845, *Hemichelidon* ... 105–106
flava Vieillot, 1817, *Campephaga* ... 33
flavipes Olivier, 1795, *Dytiscus* ... 128–130
galathea Linnaeus, 1758, *Papilio* ... 222
gallinago Linnaeus, 1758, *Scolopax* ... 95
gallopavo Linnaeus, 1758, *Meleagris* ... 70–75
garrulus Linnaeus, 1758, *Coracias* ... 57, 60
granulatus Lanchester, 1900, *Favus* ... 119–120
harmonicus Latham, 1801, *Turdus* ... 51
heinei Finsch & Hartlaub, 1870, *Myolestes* ... 41
hirundo Linnaeus, 1758, *Sterna* ... 70–75
hortulana Linnaeus, 1758, *Tipula* ... 246
hyacinthina Temminck, 1820, *Muscicapa* ... 104–105
immer Brünnich, 1764, *Colymbus* ... 7, 14
immigrans Sturtevant, 1921, *Drosophila* ... 162
incisus Leach, 1814, *Cancer* ... 271

Official List of Specific Names in Zoology, names proposed to be added to *continued*:

Page
itala Linnaeus, 1758, *Helix* ... 303, 308
japonicus de Haan, 1841, *Astacus* ... 117
lachesis Hübner, 1790, *Papilio* ... 222
leucoptera Pallas, 1811, *Alauda* ... 77–79
ligniperda Latreille, 1802, *Formica* ... 312
macroura Linnaeus, 1758, *Columba* ... 83
magnolia Wilson, 1811, *Sylvia* ... 65–67
mammillatus Schlotheim, 1813, *Ammonites* ... 254
migratoria Linnaeus, 1766, *Columba* ... 84
minimus Miller (J.S.), 1826, *Belemnites* ... 285
muelleri Ehrenberg, 1832, *Stentor* ... 218
newberryi Lea, 1858, *Planorbis* ... 326, 328
nigricollis Brehm, 1831, *Podiceps* ... 30
notata Linnaeus, 1758, *Tipula* ... 246
ochropus Linnaeus, 1758, *Tringa* ... 75
onocrotalus Linnaeus, 1758, *Pelecanus* ... 70–75
pacificus Gmelin (J.F.), [1789], *Turdus* ... 41
pantherina Linnaeus, 1758, *Musca* ... 246
pelagicus Linnaeus, 1758, *Cancer* ... 127
pellucens Linnaeus, 1758, *Musca* ... 246
philomelos Brehm, 1831, *Turdus* ... 64
pini Linnaeus, 1758, *Aphis* ... 166–173
pisana Müller (O.F.), 1774, *Helix* ... 303, 308
pruni Geoffroy, 1762, *Aphis* ... 165
pyrrhocorax Linnaeus, 1758, *Upupa* ... 58, 60
pyrrhulinus Swinhoe, 1876, *Emberiza* ... 38–39
ragoznikensis Zeuschner, 1868, *Ammonites* ... 269
roboris Linnaeus, 1758, *Aphis* ... 183
rufa Linnaeus, 1761, *Formica* ... 312, 316
rufescens Cope, 1869, *Oedipus* ... 248–249
rusticola Linnaeus, 1758, *Scolopax* ... 70–75
sepium Horsfield, 1821, *Orthotomus* ... 41
serrifer Rathbun, 1902, *Discias* ... 333
speleus Rafinesque, 1832, *Odocoileus* ... 297, 298
stairi Gray (G.R.), 1856, *Caloenas* (*Phlegoenas*) ... 41
stellatus Montagu, 1808, *Cancer* (*Astacus*) ... 339
strigosus Linnaeus, 1761, *Cancer* ... 339
subterraneus Montagu, 1808, *Cancer* (*Astacus*) ... 339
syriacus Rothschild, 1910, *Struthio camelus* ... 96–97
townsendi Oberholser, 1906, *Collocalla francica* ... 41
tuberculatus P. Roux, 1828, *Portunus* ... 127
typica Linnaeus, 1758, *Phalaena* ... 148
vermivora Gmelin (J.F.), [1789], *Motacilla* ... 65–67
virginiana Zimmermann, 1780, *Dama* ... 297, 298
yeltonensis Forster, 1767, *Alauda* ... 77–79

Official List of Works Approved as Available for Zoological Nomenclature, title of a work proposed to be added to:

Curtis (J.), 1837, *A Guide to an Arrangement of British Insects* (Edition 2), subject to an endorsement that entry proposed is exclusive of the purposes of Article 30 ... 356

Page

Oken, [1815–1816], *Lehrbuch der Naturgeschichte*, Volume 3 (*Zoologie*), Report on, prepared by Secretary at the request of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 1948 193–201

comments on the above Report 202–207

Olivigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology*... 262

onocrotalus Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Pelecanus onocrotalus* (Class Aves), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 70–75

Opinion 16, proposed addition to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* of names of certain genera discussed but not settled in 70–72

support for the above proposal... 76

Opinion 185 (suppression of Bohadsch, 1761), proposed limitation of Ruling in, to exclude suppression of the generic name *Argus* Bohadsch, 1761, for the purposes of the Law of Homonymy 283

Orbiculigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Oriolus Brisson, 1760, proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers, for the purposes both of the Law of Priority and of the Law of Homonymy 89–91

proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 92

Oriolus Linnaeus, 1766 (Class Aves), proposed validation of, under the Plenary Powers and confirmation of position of, on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* 89–92

advertisement of the above proposal 3

Ornithological Nomenclature, Standing Committee on, establishment of, by the Tenth International Ornithological Congress, Uppsala, 1950 ... 4–5

Ostreigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Ovuligenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Page

Oxychilus Fitzinger, 1833 (Class Gastropoda), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, with *Helix cellaria* Müller (O.F.), 1774, as type species 307

gender of name 307

pacificus Gmelin (J.R.), [1789], as published in the combination *Turdus pacificus* (Class Aves), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 41

Palmatrotriton Smith, 1945, proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers, for the purposes both of the Law of Priority and of the Law of Homonymy 247–249

proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 249

advertisement of the above proposal 224

comments on the above proposal 286

Pandorigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Pankhurst, Albert Stanley, see Trust, International, for Zoological Nomenclature, Membership of

Panopeigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

pantherina Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Musca pantherina* (Class Insecta, Order Diptera), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 246

Patelligenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Pavo Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Aves), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, with *Pavo cristatus* Linnaeus, 1758, as type species 70–73

gender of name 73

Pearson, Joseph, see Commission, International, on Zoological Nomenclature, Membership of

Page

Pectinigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Pectunculigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Pedigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

pelagicus Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Cancer pelagicus* (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 127

Pelecanus Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Aves), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, with *Pelecanus onocrotalus* Linnaeus, 1758, as type species 70–73

- gender of name 73

pellucens Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Musca pellucens* (Class Insecta, Order Diptera), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 246

pensylvanica Linnaeus, 1776, as published in the combination *Passer pensylvanica* (Class Aves), proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers, for the purposes both of the Law of Priority and of the Law of Homonymy 65–67

- advertisement of the above proposal 3
- proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* 65
- comment on the above proposals 68–69

penulatum Renier, [1804], as published in the combination *Scolixedion penulatum*, proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* 262

percnopterus, proposed emendation to, of *perenopterus* Linnaeus, 1748, as published in the combination *Vultur perenopterus* (Class Aves) 52

- proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* ... 52

perenopterus Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Vultur perenopterus*, proposed emendation of, to *percnopterus* (Class Aves) 52

Page

Pernigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Peters, President James Lee, see Commission, International, on Zoological Nomenclature, Membership of

Petricoligenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

phaeus Forster, 1794, as published in the combination *Turdus phaeus*, proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy ... 45–46, 50–51

- advertisement of the above proposal 3
- proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* 51

Phalaena Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera), comments regarding proposed suppression of 147–148, 149–150, 151, 153

- proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, with *Phalaena typica*, Linnaeus, 1758, as type species... 148
- gender of name 148

Phasianelligenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Phasianus Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Aves), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, with *Phasianus colchicus* Linnaeus, 1758, as type species 70–73

- gender of name 73

philomelos Brehm, 1831, as published in the combination *Turdus philomelos* (Class Aves), proposed validation of, under the Plenary Powers ... 62, 63–64

- advertisement of the above proposal 3
- proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* ... 64

Pholadigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Page

PILUMNIDAE Samouelle, 1819 (type genus : *Pilumnus* Leach, 1815), proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy... 329–331

proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family-Group Names in Zoology* 331

pini Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Aphis pini*, interpretation of (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera)

proposed addition of, determined as proposed, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 166–173

proposed designation of, under the Plenary Powers, to be the type species for *Cinara* Curtis, 1835 179–183

Pinnigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

pisana Müller (O. F.), 1774, as published in the combination *Helix pisana* (Class Gastropoda), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 303, 308

Planatella Clessin, 1876, a junior objective synonym of *Helicella* Férussac, 1821, proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 308

Plancunigenus [sic] Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Planorbigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Planospirigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Platyceros Zimmermann, 1780 (Class Mammalia), proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers 300

Pleurotomigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

plexippus Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Papilio plexippus* (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera), comments on proposed reconsideration of 139, 140

Page

Plicatuligenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Podiceps Latham, 1787 (Class Aves), proposed setting aside, under the Plenary Powers, of all previous type selections for and designation of *Colymbus cristatus* Linnaeus, 1758, to be the type species of... ... 6–7, 8–14,

gender of name 13

proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* ... 7, 13

Polycitor Renier, [1804] (Phylum Mollusca), question whether validation of, under the Plenary Powers, desirable 257–262, 263

advertisement of the above contingency 256

proposed addition of, if not so validated, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

polymorphus Renier, [1807], as published in the combination *Tubulanus polymorphus*, proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* 262

polysticta Cope, 1865, as published in the combination *Caudisona polysticta* (Class Reptilia, Order Squamata), comments on proposed validation of 155, 156

Portunus Weber, 1795 (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, with *Cancer pelagicus* Linnaeus, 1758, as type species... 122–127

gender of name 127

support for the above proposal... 127

Portunus Fabricius, 1798, proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 127

Prantl, Ferdinand, see Commission, International, on Zoological Nomenclature, Membership of

Processa Leach, 1815 (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda), proposed validation of, under the Plenary Powers 334–338

advertisement of the above proposal... 320

proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* ... 338

Page

PROCESSIDAE Ortmann, 1896 (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda), proposed validation of, under the Plenary Powers 340–341

advertisement of the above proposal 320

proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology*, with *Processa* Leach, 1815, as type genus... 339

pruni Geoffroy, 1762, as published in the combination *Aphis pruni*, and as interpreted by the reference to Réaumur (1737) specified by Geoffroy (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera), proposed validation of, under the Plenary Powers 163–165

advertisement of the above proposal... 160

proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* ... 165

Pterocerigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Pupigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Purpurigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Pyralis Fabricius, 1775 (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera), comment regarding proposed designation of type species for 155

Pyramidelligenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

pyrrhocorax Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Upupa pyrrhocorax* (Class Aves), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology*... ... ... 58, 60

Pyrrhocorax Moehring, 1758 (Class Aves), proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 58

Pyrrhocorax Nozeman & Vosmaer (*in* Moehring), 1758, proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* ... 58, 61

Page

Pyrrhocorax Brisson, 1760 (Class Aves), proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers, for the purposes of both the Law of Priority and the Law of Homonymy 58–60

proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 61

Pyrrhocorax [Tunstall], 1771 (Class Aves), proposed validation of, under the Plenary Powers, with *Upupa pyrrhocorax* Linnaeus, 1758, as type species ... 53

advertisement of the above proposal... 3

Report on the above proposal 54–61

proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* ... 60

Pyrrhocorax Vieillot, 1816, proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 61

pyrrhulinus Swinhoe, 1876, as published in the combination *Emberiza pyrrhulinus* (Class Aves), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 38–39

Pyruligenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Radiolithigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

ragoznikensis Zeuschner, 1868, as published in the combination *Ammonites ragoznikensis* (specific name of type species of *Aspidoceras* Zittel, 1868), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* ... 269

Règles Internationales de la Nomenclature Zoologique, proposed amendments and clarifications of:

Article 27, Sub-Section (a), proposed adoption of a *Declaration* recommending amendment excluding from its scope any generic name or specific name based solely upon the aptychus of an ammonite ... 266–268

advertisement of the above proposal... 256

support for the above proposal... 350

Page

Renier (S. A.), [1804], *Prospetto della Classe dei Vermi*, question whether certain generic names in should be validated under the Plenary Powers... 263

advertisement of the above question... 256

Renier (S. A.), [1804], *Tavole per servire alla classificazione e connescenza degli Animali*, proposed rejection of, for nomenclatorial purposes on the ground that this work was not published within the meaning of Article 25 of the *Règles* 257–262

proposed addition of title of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Works in Zoological Nomenclature* 262

support for the above proposal... 265

question whether certain generic names in should be validated under the Plenary Powers 262, 264

advertisement of the above question 256

rex Gould, as published in the combination *Balaeniceps rex* (Class Aves), proposed correction of date of publication of to 1850, in the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, in reference to as type species of *Balaeniceps* Gould, 1850 85–86

roboris Linnaeus, 1758, *Aphis* (Class Insecta, Order Hemiptera), proposed designation of, under the Plenary Powers, to be the type species of *Lachnus* Burmeister, 1835 175–183

proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* ... 183

Rodens Renier, [1807] (Phylum Mollusca), question whether validation of, under the Plenary Powers, desirable 257–262, 264

advertisement of the above contingency 256

proposed addition of, if not so validated, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262, 264

Rostellariigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

roycrianus d'Orbigny, 1841, as published in the combination *Ammonites roycrianus*, proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy 278–280

proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* 280

Page

rufa Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Formica rufa*, proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers 309–312, 313–317

proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* 312

rufa Linnaeus, 1761, as published in the combination *Formica rufa* (Class Insecta, Order Hymenoptera), proposed validation of, under the Plenary Powers 313–317

advertisement of the above proposal 288

report on the above proposal 309–312

proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 312, 316

rufescens Cope, 1869, as published in the combination *Oedipus rufescens* (Class Amphibia), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 248–249

Rupellarigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

rusticola Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Scolopax rusticola* (Class Aves), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 70–75

saghalinensis, proposed determination of, as a homonym of *sakhalinensis* when these names are used as specific or subspecific names in the same genus 103

saghalinensis Yamashina, 1931, as published in the combination *Dryobates leucotos saghalinensis*, proposed determination of, as a homonym of *sakhalinensis* Buturlin, 1907, as published in the combination *Picoides tridactylus sakhalinensis*... 103

proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* 103

sakhalinensis, proposed determination of, as a homonym of *saghalinensis* when these names are used as specific or subspecific names in the same genus 103

Sanguinolarigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Page

Saxicavigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Scalarigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Scathopse Geoffroy, 1762 (an incorrect Invalid Original spelling of the name *Scatopse* Geoffroy, 1762) (Class Insecta, Order Diptera), proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* ... 246

Scatopse Geoffroy, 1762 (Class Insecta, Order Diptera), proposed validation of, under the Plenary Powers 241–245

advertisement of the above proposal 224

support for the above proposal 269

gender of name 246

proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, with *Tipula notata* Linnaeus, 1758, as type species 246

Scolixedion Renier, [1804] (Phylum Mollusca), question whether validation of, under the Plenary Powers, desirable 257–262, 263

advertisement of the above contingency 256

proposed addition of, if not so validated, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262, 263

Scolopax Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Aves), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, with *Scolopax rusticola* Linnaeus, 1758, as type species 70–74

gender of name 74

senegallensis Linnaeus, 1776, as published in the combination *Picus senegallensis* (Class Aves), question of addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology*... 68–69

sepium Horsfield, 1821, as published in the combination *Orthotomus sepium* (Class Aves), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 41

Page

septentrionalis Gmelin (J.F.), 1788, as published in the combination *Lanius septentrionalis* (Class Aves), proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy 40–41

advertisement of the above proposal 3

proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* 41

serrata Renier, [1807], as published in the combination *Tellina serrata*, proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* 262

serrifer Rathbun, 1902, as published in the combination *Discias serrifer* (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 333

sibirica Gmelin (J.F.), [1789], as published in the combination *Alauda sibirica*, proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* 77–79

Sigaretigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Siliquarigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

simus Linnaeus, 1767, as published in the combination *Coluber simus* (Class Reptilia), support for the proposed determination of... ... ... 157, 158

Solarigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Solenigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Solenites Schlotheim, 1820, proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers 266–268

advertisement of the above proposal... 256

proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 268

Page

Solennites Schlotheim, 1813, proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers 266–268

advertisement of the above proposal... 256

proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 268

solitarius Oken, 1815, as published in the combination *Stentor solitarius*, proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers, for the purposes of the Law of Priority 214–217

proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* 218

spectrum Linnaeus, 1776, as published in the combination *Psittacus spectrum* (two instances) (Class Aves), question of addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* 68–69

spelcus Rafinesque, 1832, as published in the combination *Odocoileus spelcus* (Class Mammalia) (specific name of type species of *Odocoileus* Rafinesque, 1832), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 297, 298

support for the above proposal... 300

Sphinx Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera), comment regarding proposed designation of type species for 144

Spondyligenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

stairi Gray (G. R.), 1856, as published in the combination *Caloenas* (*Phlegoenas*) *stairi* (Class Aves), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 41

stellatus Montagu, 1808, as published in the combination *Cancer* (*Astacus*) *stellatus* (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 339

Stentor Geoffroy de St. Hilaire, 1812, proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers, for the purposes both of the Law of Priority and of the Law of Homonymy 208–214, 214–217

proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 218

Page

Stentor Oken, 1815 (Class Ciliophora), proposed validation of, under the Plenary Powers and addition of, to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, with *Stentor muelleri* Ehrenberg, 1832, as type species 208–214, 214–218

advertisement of the above proposal... 192

stentorea (emend. of *stentoria*) Linnaeus, 1767, as published in the combination *Hydra stentorea*, proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers, for the purposes of the Law of Priority... 214–217

proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* 218

Stentorella Reichenbach, 1828, proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 218

stentoria Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Hydra stentoria*, proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers, for the purposes of the Law of Priority 214–217

proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* 218

Sterna Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Aves), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, with *Sterna hirundo* Linnaeus, 1758, as type species 70–74

gender of name 74

Stomatiigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Stomoxys Geoffroy, 1762 (Class Insecta, Order Diptera), proposed validation of, under the Plenary Powers 241–245

advertisement of the above proposal... 224

support for the above proposal... 269

gender of name 245

proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, with *Conops calcitrans* Linnaeus, 1758, as type species... 245–246

Page

Stratiomys Geoffroy, 1762 (Class Insecta, Order Diptera), proposed validation of, under the Plenary Powers 241–245

advertisement of the above proposal... 224

support for the above proposal... 269

gender of name 245

proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, with *Musca chamaeleon* Linnaeus, 1758, as type species... 245–246

strigosus Linnaeus, 1761, as published in the combination *Cancer strigosus* (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 339

Strombigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

subterraneus Montagu, 1808, as published in the combination *Cancer* (*Astacus*) *subterraneus* (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology*... 339

sulphuratus Lichtenstein, 1793, as published in the combination *Cuculus sulphuratus*, proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy 32–33, 34–37

advertisement of the above proposal... 3

proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* 33

syriacus Rothschild, 1910, as published in the combination *Struthio camelus syriacus* (Class Aves), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 96–97

Tellinigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Terebelligenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Terebratuligenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Page

Terebrigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Teredigenus Renier, [1807], addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Testacelligenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Thalassalpes Bosc, 1813, proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy 334–338

proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 339

Thalassina Latreille, 1806 (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*... ... 337–338

THALASSINIDAE (emend. of THALASSINIDES) Latreille, 1831 (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology*, with *Thalassina* Latreille, 1806, as type genus 339

THALASSINIDES Latreille, 1831, proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family-Group Names in Zoology* 340

Theba Risso, 1826 (Class Gastropoda), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, with *Helix pisana* Müller, 1774, as type species 303, 308

gender of name 303, 308

tianschanicus, proposed determination of, as a homonym of *tianshanicus* when these names are used as specific or subspecific names in the same genus 103

tianshanicus, proposed determination of, as a homonym of *tianschanicus* when these names are used as specific or subspecific names in the same genus 103

tianshanicus Buturlin, 1910, as published in the combination *Dendrocopus* [sic] *major tianshanicus*, proposed determination of, as a junior secondary homonym in the genus *Picoides* Lacépède, 1799, of *tianschanicus* Buturlin, 1907, as published in the combination *Picoides tridactylus tianschanicus*... 103

proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* 103

Page

Tinca Geoffroy, 1762, proposed rejection of, and addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 152

townsendi Oberholser, 1906, as published in the combination *Collocalla francica townsendi* (Class Aves), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 41

Tricelia Renier, [1807] (Phylum Mollusca), question whether validation of, under the Plenary Powers, desirable 257–262, 264

proposed addition of, if not so validated, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262, 264

tricolorata Renier, [1807], as published in the combination *Aglaja tricolorata*, proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* 262

Tridacnigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Trigonellites Parkinson, 1811, proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers 266–268

advertisement of the above proposal 256

proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 268

Trigonigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Tringa Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Aves), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, with *Tringa ochropus* (emend. af *ocrophus*) Linnaeus, 1758, as type species 70–74

gender of name 74

Trochigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Trust, International, for Zoological Nomenclature, Mr. A. S. Pankhurst, retirement of, from Office of Honorary Registrar to 108

Page

Trust, International, for Zoological Nomenclature:

Balance Sheet as at 31st December 1952 and Income and Expenditure Accounts for the year 1952, with Report of Committee of Management thereon iii

Balance Sheet as at 31st December 1953 and Income and Expenditure Accounts for the year 1953, with Report of Committee of Management thereon xv

Tuba Renier, [1807], (Phylum Mollusca) question whether validation of, under the Plenary Powers, desirable 257–262, 264

advertisement of the above proposal 256

proposed addition of, if not so validated, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262, 264

Tubaria Thienemann, 1828, proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 218

tuberculatus P. Roux, 1828, as published in the combination *Portunus tuberculatus* (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 127

Tubicinelligenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Tubulanus Renier, [1807] (Phylum Mollusca), question whether validation of, under the Plenary Powers, desirable 257–262, 264

advertisement of the above proposal 256

proposed addition of, if not so validated, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262, 264

Turbinelligenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Turbinigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Turritelligenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

typica Linnaeus, 1758, as published in the combination *Phalaena typica* (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera), proposed addition of, to the *Official of List Specific Names in Zoology* 148

Tyrannula Swainson, May 1827, proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy 98–100

support for the above proposal 101

proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 100

Page

umbellatus Linnaeus, 1776, as published in the combination *Tetrao umbellatus* (Class Aves), question of addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology*... 68–69

unalaschkensis Gmelin (J.F.), [1789], as published in the combination *Hirundo unalaschkensis*, proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers, for the purposes of the Law of Priority but not for those of the Law of Homonymy 40–41

advertisement of the above proposal 3

proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* 41

Ungulinigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Uniigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Upogebia Leach, 1814 (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda), proposed validation of, under the Plenary Powers 334–338

advertisement of the above proposal 320

proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* ... 338

UPOGEBIINAE Borradaile, 1903 (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda), proposed validation of, under the Plenary Powers 340–341

advertisement of the above proposal 320

proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology*, with *Upogebia* Leach, 1814, as type genus 339

Upupa Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Aves), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, with *Upupa epops* Linnaeus, 1758, as type species 70–74

gender of name 74

variopadata Renier, [1807], as published in the combination *Tricelia variopadata*, proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* 262

Venericardigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Page

Venerigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Vermicularigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Vermivora Linnaeus, 1776, proposed suppression of, under the Plenary Powers, for the purposes both of the Law of Priority and of the Law of Homonymy 65–67

advertisement of the above proposal 3

proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 65

comment on the above proposals 68–69

vermivora Gmelin (J.F.), [1789], as published in the combination *Motacilla vermivora* (Class Aves), proposed validation of, under the Plenary Powers to be the name of the Worm-Eating Warbler, and addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 65–67

virginiana Zimmermann, 1780, as published in the combination *Dama virginiana* (Class Mammalia), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 297, 298

support for the above proposal 300

voarula Linnaeus, 1776, as published in the combination *Motacilla voarula* (Class Aves), question of addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Trivial Names in Zoology* 68–69

Volucella Geoffroy, 1762 (Class Insecta, Order Diptera), proposed validation of, under the Plenary Powers 241–245

advertisement of the above proposal 224

support for the above proposal 269

gender of name 245

proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, with *Musca pellucens* Linnaeus, 1758, as type species 245–246

Volutigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Page

Volvarigenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

Vulselligenus Renier, [1807], proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 262

XANTHINAE Dana, 1851 (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda), proposed validation of, under the Plenary Powers 329–331

advertisement of the above proposal 320

proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology*, with *Xantho* Leach, 1814, as type genus 331

Xantho Leach, 1814 (Class Crustacea, Order Decapoda), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology*, with *Cancer incisus* Leach, 1814, as type species 270–271

gender of name 271

Xantho Dutrochet, 1819, proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 271

Xanthus Agassiz, 1843, proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 271

Xerophila Held, 1837, a junior objective synonym of *Theba* Risso, 1826, proposed addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* 308

yeltonensis Forster, 1767, as published in the combination *Alauda yeltonensis* (Class Aves), proposed addition of, to the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* 77–79

zeylonicus Linnaeus, 1776, as published in the combination *Turdus zeylonicus* (Class Aves), question of addition of, to the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Specific Names in Zoology* 68–69

PARTICULARS OF DATES OF PUBLICATION OF THE SEVERAL PARTS IN WHICH THE PRESENT VOLUME WAS PUBLISHED

Part No.	*Contents of Part (pages)*	*Date of Publication*
1/3	1–106	15th October 1952
4/5	107–158, 1 pl.	30th December 1952
6	159–190	11th May 1954
7	191–222	11th May 1954
8	223–254	11th May 1954
9	255–286	22nd October 1954
10	287–318	30th December 1954
11	319–350	30th December 1954
12	351—442 [i]—xxix T.P.—XXXV	31st January 1956

INSTRUCTIONS TO BINDERS

The present Volume should be bound up as follows :—T.P.—XXXV, [i]—xxix, 1—442

Note :—The wrappers (covers) of the twelve Parts in which this Volume was published should be bound in at the end of the Volume.

CONTENTS

(continued from front wrapper)

(New Application)

Page

Curtis (J.), 1837, *A Guide to an Arrangement of British Insects*, second edition, proposed determination of status of for purposes of Rule (g) in Article 30. By C. W. Sabrosky (*U.S. Department of Agriculture, Entomology Research Branch, Washington, D.C., U.S.A.*) 353

Support for, and supplementary proposal relating to, the above application. By Francis Hemming, C.M.G., C.B.E. (*Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature*) ... 355

Corrigenda, Authors' and Subject Indexes 357

International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature : Accounts for the years 1952 and 1953 and Reports of the Committee of Management thereon iii

Title Page, Foreword, Table of Contents ... ... T.P.– XXV

Notice to Subscribers

The next volume (Volume 10) was devoted to the publication of the concluding portion of the documents prepared for the Agenda for the discussion on zoological nomenclature held at Copenhagen in 1953. Accordingly the first instalment of applications relating to individual names or the status of books to be published after the issue of Part 11 of the present volume appeared in Volume 11 of the present serial.

The present opportunity is taken also to draw attention to the important series of " Directions " amplifying, clarifying, and, in certain circumstances, correcting Rulings given in " Opinions " rendered in the pre-Lisbon (1935) period now being published in Section C of Volume 1 of the " Opinions and Declarations " Series.

1956-5P
col
1/70